# " DRAVIDIAN "

A Course of Three Lectures on Dravidian Origins and on Modern Dravidian Literature delivered before the Annamalai University in February 1963

BY

**SUNITI KUMAR CHATTERJI**

M. A. (Calcutta), D. Litt. (London),
Hon. D. Litt. (Rome), Hon. D. Litt. (Delhi);
Bhashacharya, Sahitya-Vachaspati, Padma-Vibhushana;
Emeritus Professor of Comparative Philology, University of Calcutta;
Formerly Chairman, West Bengal Legislative Council (1952-1965);
National Professor of India in Humanities

ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY
ANNAMALAINAGAR (MADRAS STATE)

1965

Rs 4 - 00

Githa Press, Tiruchi-2,

PUBLICATIONS IN LINGUISTICS NO. 7.

# PREFACE

Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji who presided over a committee for organising the present Linguistics Department of Annamalai University was kind enough to deliver, under the chairmanship of Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, the Vice-Chancellor, the three special lectures on Dravidian in 1963 in the very department he had organised. These lectures are now before the world of scholars interested in Dravidian Research. The Linguistics Department is really happy that it has been given this privilege of publishing this valuable contribution of our great National Professor.

Annamalainagar,
16—12—1965.

T. P. MEENAKSHISUNDARAM.

# FOREWORD

In February 1963 I gave three lectures before the Linguistics and Dravidian Languages Section of the Annamalai University on the Origins of Dravidian and on the local Dravidian Elements in the Modern Literatures of South India.

Dr. C P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Vice-Chancellor of the Annamalai University, inaugurated these lectures. They are now being published in the present volume, and I trust they will be conducive to some further consideration of the problems.

I have to thank Shri J. M. Somasundaram Pillai of the Annamalai University as well as the Registrar for their interest in the work and their help in bringing it out as early as possible. These lectures created some interest among students and others, and I have to thank all who helped to make the reading of these lectures a success by their presence and their interest.

Calcutta,

July 13, 1965 SUNITI KUMAR CHATTE

This little book is dedicated to

---

**Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar**

Scholar – Administrator – Educationist,

Philosopher – Humanist – Internationalist,

Great Organiser,

Exponent and Interpreter of India's Thought and Culture;

Our most esteemed Leader during our Tour in China in 1955;

Vice-Chancellor, Annamalai University

---

as a small token of

deep Respect and Affection and profound Admiration

Calcutta:
Guru-Purnima Day,
22 Ashadha, Saka 1887,
13th July 1965

**Suniti Kumar Chatterji**

# CONTENTS


| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Lecture I: | 'Dravidian' (I), | pp. 1–26 |
| 2. | Lecture II: | 'Dravidian' (II), | pp. 27–54 |
| 3. | Lecture III: | The "Matter of Dravida-desa or Tiravida-nadu" in South Indian Literatures | pp. 55–83 |

# ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY

## THREE LECTURES

**Delivered on February 2, 3 and 4, 1963**

## LECTURE I

## DRAVIDIAN (I)

**1. The Term Dravida – Dravidian.**

The word *Dravidian* is an Anglo-Indian expression, a word created by British scholars in India, and is a hybrid consisting of the Indian or Sanskrit word *Drāviḍa* and the English adjectival suffix *-ian*, which itself is from the Latin. The original Sanskrit word has currently three forms, *Dramiḍa*, *Draviḍa* and *Drāviḍa*, and there are some subtle differences in the use of these three forms. The form of *Dramiḍa* was definitely employed with regard to the Tamil-speaking section within the Dravidian family, just as the term *Andhra* is used with regard to Telugu-speakers and *Karṇāṭa* with regard to Kannada-speakers and their country, and *Kērala* similarly stands for the Malayalam-speaking people and the Malayali country. But occasionally, in modern times particularly, *Dramiḍa* is used in a much wider and almost an all-inclusive sense, to indicate what is denoted by 'Dravidian'. With regard to the other form *Draviḍa* - *Drāviḍa*, this is on the face of it a later modification of *Dramiḍa*, in which an intervocal *-m-* has been changed to a *-v-*, and thus *Draviḍa* is a modification and an extension of *Dramiḍa*. The original Indian words as well as their

Anglicised form are thus found to be used in two contexts: (1) a narrow or restricted one, in which *Dramiḍa* (and *Draviḍa* and *Drāviḍa*) are used practically as identical with *Tamil*, and in this sense it is confined to the Tamil-speakers of both South India and Ceylon; then we have (2) an extended sense, in which *Drāviḍa* as well as *Draviḍa*, and to a lesser extent *Dramiḍa*, are used to indicate that very extensive language-family with all its various component languages and dialects as well as the peoples who speak them. This second sense can be said to be a modern application of *Draviḍa*, *Dramiḍa* and *Dravidian*, which is to some extent based on early Indian usage as well. The Tamil people now also use the Sanskrit form *Draviḍa* in its Tamilised spelling as *Tiraviḍa* in this wider, all-inclusive sense. In one of his great poems, the *Jana-gaṇa-mana-Adhināyaka* ("the Supreme Leader of the minds of men and peoples"), which has been adopted as the National Anthem of India, Rabindranath Tagore has used the word *Drāviḍa* in this extended sense, in the two lines in the first stanza where he has enumerated or suggested the main areas of India:

> *Pañjāba - Sindhu - Gujarāta - Marāṭhā - Drāviḍa - Utkala-Vaṅga,*
>
> *Vindhya - Himācala - Yamunā - Gaṅgā Ucchvala Jaladhi-taraṅga.*

*Dramiḍa, Kērala, Karṇāṭa, Andhra* — these (as said above) indicate normally in Sanskrit the four advanced language groups of South India — Tamil, Malayalam, Kannada and Telugu respectively. But in mediaeval times in India we have a division of the Brahmans into two main groups, each consisting of five sections. These are (1) the *Pañca-Gauḍa* and (2) the *Pañca-Drāviḍa*.

The *Pañca-Gauḍa* include five groups of Aryan-speaking Brahmans — *Gauḍa, Sārasvata, Kānya-kubja, Utkala* and *Kāśmīra*. Here the word *Gauḍa* does not mean specifically Bengal or West Bengal — *Gauḍa* refers to a much wider area including Eastern U.P.; and this name, standing for one of the five groups into which the Brahmans of North India were rather arbitrarily divided, was an extension of the name of one section for the entire group consisting of its five sections. Similarly, *Pañca-Drāviḍa* meant five groups of Brahmans living in the Deccan and South India, both Aryan-speaking and non-Aryan speaking, namely *Gūrjara, Māhārāṣṭra, Kārṇāṭa, Āndhra* and *Drāviḍa*, the last including the Brahmans both of Tamil-nad and of Kerala. Here at any rate, from the term *Pañca-Drāviḍa*, we have a wider use of the name *Drāviḍa*, to mean, not the Brahmans among the Tamils only, but also those among the other three peoples of Dravidian speech—the Malayalis, the Kannadigas and the Telugus, besides those Brahmans who were living in the Aryan-speaking Gujarat and Maharashtra. In this sense, the extension of the term *Dravidian* or *Drāviḍa* for the whole family has not been entirely recent and arbitrary. These names *Pañca-Drāviḍa* and *Pañca-Gauḍa* would appear to have been first used during the closing centuries of the first millennium A.D., if not earlier.

The wider sense of *Drāviḍa* is certainly quite well established now. Even some of the extreme protagonists of an aggresive " Dravidianism " in the political domain in India, who in this mis-conceived zeal for a Dravidadom which is in a state of uncompromising conflict with Aryanism and Aryandom have expressed

their desire to create a *Drāviḍa-sthāna* or *Dravidistan* in South India, within or outside of the Indian Union. The geographical concept of an area in India where the great Dravidian languages are spoken and are properly established in compact *blocs* is there; and following that, we can speak of a *Drāviḍa-dēśa*, or *Drāviḍa-nāḍu* a "Dravidian Land", or can even use a shorter word *Drāviḍakam*, following the Old Tamil word *Tamizhakam* or *Tamiḻakam*, to mean the Tamil-Malayalam country which was adopted into Greek as *Damirikē* in the early centuries of the Christian era.

**2. The Conception of Linguistic Families: a "Dravidian Family of Languages" proposed over a 100 years ago.**

According to the ideas of the orthodox scholars of Sanskrit, both in North and South India, the Dravidian languages of Central and South India, like all other languages of the entire world, came into being through a modification of the Language of the Gods, namely, Sanskrit. This view has not become wholly obsolete; even at the present day, and in South India even now, we may find old-fashioned and orthodox *pandits* who believe in the Sanskrit origin of the Dravidian languages. In the earlier days, naturally enough, no one could conceive of "Linguistic Families"—this conception is a very modern one in the linguistic science. People took it as a matter of course that the language of the sacred books of their religion was not only a sacred speech to be venerated as the repository of the teaching of their religion but it was at the same time the oldest of all languages, and the mother of all speech. In the Christian West, people piously believed that all the languages of the world were derived from Hebrew, which was the language used

by Jehovah in heaven: *terricolis multae linguae, caelicolis una* "there are many languages among those who dwell on earth, but only one among those who dwell in heaven". So similarly among the Brahmans and others, in India, Sanskrit, the *Dēva-bhāṣā* or the Language of Gods, was the source of all languages. The Hinayana Buddhists using Pali scriptures were taught that Pali, wrongly called *Māgadhī*, was the 'Root-language' (*mūla-bhāsā*) in which the people of the primeval age, Brahmans (divine sages), those who never heard any other speech, and the supreme Buddhas used to converse (*sā māgadhī mūla-bhāsā, narā yāy' ādikappikā: brahmāṇo c'assutālāpā sambuddhā câpi bhāsarē*). So too with the early Jains, the Prakrit of the Jaina canon was the *ārṣa*, the speech of the sages, and the basic language on which Sanskrit and the rest stood. The orthodox Brahman idea has been that from Sanskrit some kind of Prakrit evolved, comparable with the other Prakrits that we know of, like Sauraseni, Magadhi, Maharashtri; and from this Prakrit the various Dravidian languages have sprung. Books have been written in English seeking to establish this thesis; but this is not seriously accepted. And as a counterblast, some ardent patriots among Tamilians, with more enthusiasm than knowledge and common sense, have declared that the Tamil of the Sangam Literature is the Primeval Speech – the *Tāy-mozhi* or the great Mother Language, from which all other languages of the world, including Sanskrit and the languages of Europe, have originated.

By inaugurating a comparative study of Sanskrit, Old Iranian (Avestan and Old Persian), Greek, Latin, Gothic and finally Old Irish, Old Slav, Tokharian (Kuchean) and Ancient Hittite, European scholars were

able to establish the existence of an ***Indo-European*** family of languages, and even of an earlier stage behind this Indo-European family, viz. the *Indo-Hittite*. The similarities between Sanskrit and the other ancient Indo-European languages were so close and so striking that by comparing them it was possible gradually to establish their common source, with a hypothetical re-construction of this source-speech in its sound-system, its morphology and its syntax, and also in its vocabulary. It was through the discovery of Sanskrit by Europe during the end of the 18th century and the comparative study of it with the classical languages and the modern languages of Europe, that the Indo-European speech-family has been established, and the concept of languages grouping themselves into different families also came to be accepted. This was one of the greatest advances in linguistic studies; certainly, it was one of the major achievements of the mind of man in unravelling its own antecedents and its development. The method which enabled us to postulate an Indo-European family were extended to other groups of languages; and then gradually, side by side with the Indo-European and its earlier form, the Indo-Hittite, it has been possible to postulate a number of other and quite independent language-families, existing side by side with Indo-European from time immemorial; like, for example, the Semitic-Hamitic, the Ural-Altaic, the Sino-Tibetan, the Sudanic African (West and Central African), the Bantu African (Central and South African), and the Austric with its two branches Austro-Asiatic and Austronesian; besides a large number of language-families in the two Americas.

As early as the second decade of the 19th century, William Carey, the Baptist Missionary Linguist of Serampore in Bengal, felt that the languages of South India, Tamil, Telugu etc., formed a different group from those of North India. But it was the great Sanskrit scholar and the first editor of the Rig Veda, Friedrich Max Mueller, who, in the fifties of the last century, first separated the Dravidian languages as being members of a distinct family of their own. From that time onward, the word ***Dravidian*** became well-established in India as a name for that distinct speech-family; and naturally in India we began to employ the original forms of this word in the same sense. In 1856 Bishop Robert Caldwell brought out his great book "A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages of South India", and this was a fundamental work which finally established Dravidian on the language-map of India and the world. Not only that: Caldwell's pioneer work also made it clear for us the basic characteristics of Dravidian phonology and morphology as well as vocabulary.

### 3. The Indo-European Speech-Family.

These conclusions were gradually arrived at through a study of historical and comparative philology, with the postulation and establishment of the Primitive Indo-European Language, the lost source of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and the rest. Primitive Indo-Eruropean, it was believed, was spoken in some country outside India some thousands of years ago, and it took up its definite character, as established by the comparative method, in some area outside India. But what was the country of the characterisation and first establishment of the Primitive Indo-European speech,

and how old was the period when this happened, have not been settled with unanimity. But the consensus of opinion among specialists in this subject would suggest that in the wide, dry grass-lands in East Europe and Central Asia, to the south of the Ural Mountains, some 3000 years before Christ, this Primitive Indo-European language was in use among a people, whose physical characteristics also have been suggested as being that of the Nordic race – tall and fair, long-headed and long-nosed, blue-eyed and golden-haired. But this matter has been also disputed, and one cannot be definite that the Primitive Indo-Europeans were a pure race – they might have been very much mixed. From their original homeland in the regions to the south of the Ural Mountains, the Primitive Indo-Europeans spread to the West and to the South. Groups of them went to Eastern Europe, and further beyond to Central Europe and Western Europe, as well as to the countries of Southern Europe like the Balkans and Greece and Italy. Other groups trekking West went South and crossed the Caucasus Mountains and gradually found themselves in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia; and in Asia Minor they met currents of their own kinsmen who had come there by way of Eastern Europe, the Balkans and Greece, passing on to Asia Minor from Greece. Similar groups would appear to have spread to Central Asia and then to what is now Sin-Kiang or Chinese Turkistan. From Asia Minor and Mesopotamia they pushed towards the East and came to Iran, and then finally into India. The earlier European investigators, linguistic scholars like Max Mueller, thought that Central Asia, which was at that time very little known and was a land of romantic mystery, the homeland of many races, was the original abode of the

Indo-Europeans; and it was from there that they easily came first to Eastern Iran and then from Eastern Iran they passed to the West towards Mesopotamia on the one hand and then into India, the Panjab, on the other. But now-a-days a series of other facts seem to establish that the Indo-European people, when they came into Asia, come both from Greece in the West and from the North through the Caucasus Mountains, and then they settled in parts of Northern Mesopotamia. From Northern Mesopotamia (and not from Cenral Asia) they pushed towards Persia, and then through Afghanistan they finally arrived in India.

**4. The Development of the Idea that the Indo-Europeans were a Superior Race — a "Herrenvolk"; Repercussions of this Idea in India.**

The earlier investigators into the Indo-European and Aryan problem were influenced by certain pre-conceived notions. When it became established that Sanakrit, Greek, Latin and its descendants the modern Romance languages, the Germanic languages like English, German, Dutch, Scandinavian etc., the Celtic languages like Irish and Welsh, and the Slav languages like Russian, Polish and Czech, were related to eachr other as sisters and cousins, they concluded that the Primitive Indo-European people speaking the mother of all these languages were, like their later descendants the modern peoples of Europe, an advanced and a dominating people – a sort of *Herrenvolk* – who spread out from their homeland and made easy conquests of the oountries to which they went. In most of the countries where they established themselves, particularly in India according to this old view, the original inhabitants were in a state of barbarism and they could not boast of any

culture. Just as during the last 500 years the Portuguese, the Spaniards, the Dutch, the English, and the French, peoples of Indo-European speech from Western Europe, went to different countries of Africa. Asia and America, and made easy conquests of the peoples of these areas, particularly in America, Africa and South-Eastern Asia, and established their commercial as well as political supremacy in these tracts, even setting up great empires, — the Primitive Indo-Europeans, as the ancestors of these peoples of Western Europe, similarly had anticipated their descendants by spreading out to different countries, particularly countries of the "coloured" races, and made similar easy conquests of the original peoples and established themselves as their rulers. A new theory of history therefore developed in this way — that of a highly civilised white Indo-European or Aryan people spreading out and conquering different countries in Asia and Europe, and establishing themselves as a ruling and a civilising force. The present day ideas of European imperialism and racialism as well as contempt and prejudice against colour were responsible for this. In India, after the British had established themselves as white rulers in a brown man's country, they thought that their achievement was comparable to that of the first Aryan conquerors of India: They began to look upon the ancient Aryans as a sort of prototypes of the white Europeans. And it easily came to be accepted that it was these Aryans who brought the light of civilisation and organisation to the benighted dark-skinned pre-Aryan barbarians of India, the Kol or Muṇda or Austric, the Mongoloid and the Dravidian peoples. The accredited descendants of the Aryan conquerors were the members of the higher castes in

Hindu society—the Brahmans, the Kshatriyas and the Vaisyas; and the Sudras were looked upon as the descendants of the dark-skinned pre-Aryan aboriginals who had no civilisation worth mentioning and who were content to accept an inferior position in a new society organised by the Aryans. In India, it was the persons belonging to these upper castes who first largely took to English education, and they did not have much difficulty in accepting this new point of view that their ancestors were the true Aryan conquerors of India, whereas the non-Brahmans, non-Kshatriyas and non-Vaisyas—the masses of the Sudras in the country—were the descendants of the pre-Aryans. This gave them a sense of community of language and race with the British conquerors—although they would not be very anxious to analyse this feeling. But it did not displease them to find that they were related in language and race to the new white rulers of India. The Englishmen in India also kindly patted the back of the upper-class Hindu, by acknowledging him to be their "Aryan Brother, the Mild Hindu."

The acceptance of Brahman superiority and Brahman lead was one of the characteristics of Hindu society, and the members of the non-Brahman groups, whenever they understood this new interpretation of Indian history, did not have anything to say against it and they acquiesced themselves into this point of view, just as their ancestors had accepted the superiority and the rule of the Aryans in by-gone centuries. It was believed that those conquered non-Aryans who lived in an Aryan-dominated society became part of the Hindu body-politic as the great masses of its non-Aryan members, the various Sudra castes; only those who

did not come within the orbit of this Aryan-organised society escaped to the hills and forests of Central India and South India, and there they remained in a very primitive state, as the so-called aboriginal tribes of India, both Dravidian and Austric (or Munda or Kol), and the Kirata or Mongoloid tribes of the Himalayan tracts and North-Eastern India. In these inaccessible areas, far from the centres of the riverain civilisations which were built up in India, they still live in a primitive state, with just a little primitive agriculture and hunting.

### 5. Various Races and Languages as well as Cultures in India.

But owing to the discovery of new facts, the above reconstruction of the history and civilisation in India has been found no longer tenable. We are now coming to accept the position that civilisation in India developed along different lines, and the racial and cultural contributions were not all to the credit of the Aryan or Indo-European group alone. From pre-historic times, we have in India these four great language-families, namely the following: (1) the Austric family, (2) the Dravidian family, (3) the Sino-Tibetan (Mongoloid) family, and (4) the Indo-European or Aryan family. Of these, the Austric family appears to be the most ancient one still surviving on the soil of India. Before the Austrics, there were certain Negrito people who came from Africa along the coast-line of Arabia and Iran. But these Negrito people almost entirely disappeared from the soil of India, only a few pockets of Negritos remaining in insolated places at the present age.

1. The Austrics are represented in present-day India (and in Indo-China and Indonesia, beyond to the east) by the Mons or Talaings of Burma, the Khmers of Cambodia and a few small groups like the Palaungs and Was of Burma, the Khasis of Assam and the various Munda or Kol peoples of India like the Santals, the Mundas, the Hos, the Korwas, the Kharias, the Kurkus, the Juangs and the Savaras, and the Veddahs of Ceylon. The Austric people of India at one time were to be found all over the country, and at the present day they have merged into the Hindu population, contributing a large section of the masses, particularly in the lower ranks of the society. Outside India these Austrics have their linguistic kinsmen in Indo-China (as mentioned above), in Indonesia, in Melanesia and in Polynesia. The Austrics are believed to be a very old off-shoot of the Mediterranean race, long-headed and of medium size, who were much mixed with other peoples on their way to India from the Eastern Mediterranean areas (Syria etc.) in pre-historic times. From India they passed out to Ceylon, Indo-China and Indonesia and beyond, and an early off-shoot of these are the Australian aborigines (the "Black Fellows").

2. The Dravidian family and the Dravidian people will be discussed later. They appear to have come after the Austrics, and like the Austrics themselves they came from the Mediterranean area, according to the view expressed by a number of anthropologists, which appear to have strong support.

3. The Sino-Tibetan language-group and the peoples speaking it came from the East — from Tibet, through the Himalayas, and from South-Eastern China,

through Northern Burma and Assam. They are now found largely in Assam, in North and East Bengal, in North Bihar, in Nepal and in the sub-Himalayan areas. They appear to have penetrated in some places right down to Rajasthan and Central India. It would appear that they had come to India even before the Aryans.

4. Finally, we have the Aryans or Indo-Europeans, whose original language in India, which we find in the Vedas, gradually changed into the various Prakrits on the one hand and Classical Sanskrit on the other, and from the Prakrits we have the Apabhramsas and the modern Indo-Aryan *Bhāṣās*, Bengali, Oriya, Maithil, Bhojpuri, Awadhi, Hindi, Rajasthani, Gujarati, Marathi, Sindhi, Panjabi, Nepali and the rest. The Aryan language has spread in North India and in the Deccan very largely at the expense of the non-Aryan speeches, whether of the Austric or Dravidian or Sino-Tibetan family; and large numbers of these pre-Aryans or non-Aryans have now linguistically merged into an Aryan-speaking Hindu or Muslim people of North India and the Deccan.

After the Aryans came as a very well-organised people with a remarkable power of adaptability, a beautiful and expressive language and a fine imagination, together with a very wholesome reasonableness both in society and religion, they found themselves face to face with the pre-Aryan peoples in India. They stood as a puissant band of new-comers on the one hand, and the Austric, the Dravidian and the Mongoloid peoples were in front of them on the other. Through contact, conflict and compromise, spread over a large number of centuries, a fusion of these peoples started – racially, linguistically and culturally. There is evidence of a considerable

intermixture of peoples – Aryan, Dravidian, Austric and Mongoloid commingling to give a new type of humanity on the soil of India. The Aryan language got the upper hand in North India and the Deccan, and even in South India, among the Dravidian-speakers. But in the course of this, a new type of culture and mentality was developed in India among this new mixed people—a culture which was the joint creation of the Aryans and the non-Aryans, particularly the Dravidians. Indian civilisation is thus a composite, and not specifically a gift of the Aryans. It would appear that in North India, in the great river-valleys, the Austrics were more predominant (at least numerically) than the Dravidians, and in South India also there was an Austric basis for the population. The Dravidians came later. The Mongoloids also arrived in India fairly early.

The speakers of these four language-groups were face to face with each other round about 1500 B.C. when the Aryans were coming to India and establishing themselves: Aryan, Dravidian, Austric and Mongoloid. We are interested in the second group, the Dravidians, in our present survey. What information is available to us about the origin and antecedents of the Dravidians in India? What are our sources of knowledge? Where did they come from originally? In their culture, their ways of life and thought, what were they like, 3500 years ago? What are the elements which were contributed by them in the evolution of the Indian civilisation?

Up to very recent times, the third decade of the 20th century, our main source of information about the Dravidians was from a study of (1) the actual life

of the Dravidian-speakers, both advanced and backward, particularly the backward ones, and of (2) the Dravidian languages as well as the various literatures available in them. But the more advanced Dravidian peoples present a type of culture and mentality, a way of thought and a way of life which is no longer definitely Dravidian as against Aryan in present-day India. **There has developed one common type of pan-Indian culture which has been the joint creation of the Aryan and non-Aryan, to which all the different groups in India offer their homage.** It is only among the more primitive Dravidian peoples who are outside of the Aryan orbit – the orbit of the common Aryan–cum–non-Aryan civilisation – that we can get some vestiges of what may be called the Primitive Dravidian Atmosphere.

### 6. Racial, Linguistic and Cultural Fusion in India; Dravidian Origins.

If we can use our historical imagination and take ourselves back to some 3500 years from now, we would be able to see that there was no common Hindu world but there were some four distinct worlds of the Aryan, the Dravidian, the Austric (or Munda) and the Mongoloid, each with its own type of language and what may be called its "language-culture". The general view has been that when the Aryans came to India they were a group of semi-nomads. Their clans *(grāmas)* were frequently on the move: as it is said in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* about one Aryan king — "he was moving about with his clan" *(sa grāmēṇa pari cacāra)*. Where these clans would meet for purposes of fighting, it would be a *saṅ-grāma*, "a gathering of clans", called to battle. The Aryans had herds of horses and cattle and

flocks of sheep and goats as their main source of wealth. They did a little agriculture – they knew the barley, and then in Iran and India they found wheat and rice. They had no use for cities : their National God, Indra, had the epithet *Puran-dara*, or "the Destroyer of Cities".

On the other hand, it has been presumed, and on good reasons too, that the Dravidians (at least in North India) formed a settled community of agriculturists and herdsmen who lived in cities with fortifications, and they had many amenities of advanced city life, like public baths, houses of more than one storey and masonry drains. The word *nagara* itself, meaning "city" in Sanskrit, appears to be of Dravidian origin. It has been presumed that the city-culture of important sites in the Panjab and Sindh and even in Gujarat, influences of which penetrated further East and South (even in distant Bengal traces of this North-Western Indian culture have been found), was the creation of Dravidian-speakers. Although it has not been established beyond any doubt, it is believed that the builders of the Harappa and Mohen-jo-Daro culture of Panjab and Sindh spoke a Dravidian language : the presence of the Brahuis with their Dravidian language in near-by Baluchistan next door to Sindh is suggestive of the fact that the Brahuis represent only the remnants of a big *bloc* of Dravidian-speakers who in pre-historic times had occupied considerable portions of Panjab, Sindh and beyond, and Saurashtra and Gujarat and tracts even further to the East and South. If this presumption is correct, then we will have to say that the oldest city-civilisation of India is to be associated with the Dravidian-speakers. And this city-civilisation meant a lot of

things which the Aryans were not familiar with. But we cannot be absolutely certain about this matter until the riddle of the Mohen-jo-Daro and Harappa script is solved – until we find out what language is represented in these seals. Very fantastic guesses in this connexion have been made by scholars, both Indian and foreign. Some, like the late Father Heras, the Spanish Catalonian Jesuit Missionary, who was a great student of Indian History and who passed away in India, would like to read Old Tamil of the first half of the first millennium A.D. in these Sindh and Panjab seals which go back to the 4th millennium B.C. Even the great B. Hrozny', who discovered the proper Indo-European affinities of the ancient Hittite speech of Asia Minor, thought he found a kind of Indo-European Hittite speech in these seals. There are other suggestions which, to say the least, are fantastic. We have got to have patience in this matter, and wait until we might fortunately discover some bilingual writing, in both the Sindh and Panjab script and in some other script and language, already known, and then alone it would be possible to come to some definite conclusions.

### 7. The Dravidians of India: Affinities with the Primitive Mediterranean People suggested by Ethnology and Anthropology: the Views of James Hornell.

There are very many items in the cultural life of India which have to be associated with the pre-Aryan peoples in this country. Many of these items would suggest an affinity and a connexion of some of these pre-Aryan peoples—in all likelihood, of the Dravidians —with the peoples of the Eastern Mediterranean area in Europe—mainland Greece before the coming of the Hellenes, Crete and the Greek Islands in the Aegean

Sea, and parts of Asia Minor. Anthropologists have made a close comparative study of some of these points, with similar things in the basic civilisation in India in many matters, One was a survey of the types of boats and other nautical craft which were in use in India. From an appraisement of this very important aspect of the civilised life of a people, Dr. James Hornell came to the following interesting and important conclusions.

In his very important monograph on "The Origins and the Ethnological Significance of Indian Boat Designs" by James Hornell, Director of Fisheries, Madras Government, published in the Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. VII, Number 1, 1918, pages 139 to 256 (with six plates), he sums up the ethnological situation as follows:

"Some of the main conclusions I am forced to say appear startling, and I do not put them forward other than as part of certain working hypotheses which have in their favour a number of important ethnological facts, some of which have been enumerated whilst others will be mentioned later. It will however be convenient, if, before doing so, I outline the hypotheses which I wish to put forward. Stated in as few words as possible, I believe the evidence of boat design in India, taken together with that of several peculiar methods of fishing practised in certain Indian localities and reinforced by various philological and ethnological data already known, lead us to the following conclusions, viz.:

"(a) The Pre-Dravidian coast population of Southern India was composed of varying blends of Negrito and proto-Polynesian stocks, the former the

earlier. The former appear to have contributed a considerable portion of the round-headed element in the very dark races in hill and forest tracts.

"(b) The Polynesian section of the pre-Dravidian coastal population of India is responsible for the introduction of the single outrigger form of canoes and boats, which in Polynesia of the present day is the characteristic and predominant type of boat-design.

"(c) From the universality of the double outrigger design among Malaysians (Indonesians) and its absence among the out-rigger-using races of Polynesia, Papuasia and Australia, save exceptionally on those shores turned towards Malaysia, I judge the double outrigger to be of Malaysian invention.

"(d) The fact that the outrigger canoes of Madagascar and East Africa are typically of the double form, and that the design of the float attachment is of a very peculiar type, such as is elsewhere confined strictly at the present day to the northern coast of Java, make it appear probable that the colonists of Madagascar who introduced this double form of outrigger came from this particular region in Malaysia

"(e) A Malaysian wave of immigration via Ceylon appears to have followed the Polynesian at a much later date, and after the advent of the Dravidians, bringing cocoanut cultivation from the Malay Archipelago. The Shanars and Izhuvans (toddy-tappers) of South India probably date their ancestry to these immigrants.

"(f) That the true Dravidians belong to the Mediterranean race.

"(g) That the Dravidians acquired many customs now considered typical of the Mediterranean race while in the undivided race state, e. g. certain river boat forms and particularly the quarter rudder; also probably the use of the conch shell, though this is common also to the Papuasian and Polynesian peoples.

"(h) That before splitting off from the original stock, those of the Dravidians living in Mesopotamia borrowed or invented the circular coracle, and the reed-raft.

"(i) That some large portion of the race was subsequently forced by circumstances, possibly the pressure of some Alpine or Mongoloid race from the north-west (Akkads) or of Semitic people from the south or south west, to pass eastwards, the Brahui language marking their presence at one time in Baluchistan.

"(j) That on arrival in India from Baluchistan, they spread along the valleys of the Indus and the Ganges, introducing the boat forms of the Nile and the Tigris as they went, the former on the large perennial rivers, the latter on those which carry little water in the dry season.

"(k) The Dravidians being inland or rather river people were clever irrigation agriculturists; to them it seems clear that we owe the eminence that India has had in this art throughout the historic period.

"(l) Being river people, the early Dravidians would be glad to press the Polynesian sea-fishermen into their service, and to learn this art from them.

"(m) The Polynesian element seems to have been entirely absorbed politically and linguistically by the Dravidians, a result explicable by the fewness of their numbers, their scattered condition, and their greater plasticity due to their hybrid origin (? Caucasian × Mongolian × Papuasian)."

Here what is very valuable for us are the points enumerated by Hornell under captions (f) to (m) above.

**8. Other Views : F. J. Richards, Georges Olivier.**

What he has categorically said under (f), that the Dravidians belong to the Mediterranean race, Hornell has supported by quoting the opinion of another investigator F. J. Richards, I.C.S., who in the Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society of Bangalore, July 1917, has brought in a number of points in support. Outside of the data presented by the boat designs, Anthropology also has come to maintain this view.

In his paper "Some Dravidian Affinities, and their Sequel" (pp 243-284), after discussing some of the problems of Dravidian origins and affinities from the point of view of Anthropology and Anthropometry, Richards has come to the following conclusions regarding the component elements of the Dravidian population of India (p. 277 of the above article) :

(1) A broad-nosed 'Pre-Dravidian' race akin to the Jungle Tribes, (and to the Munda-speaking races? and Melanesians?), probably composite in origin, compounded perhaps of Negroid and intermediate (? Mediterranean) elements.

(2) The Dravidians properly so called, being the main body of the population of South India, and composed of many different strata of the Mediterranean race in varying degrees of purity and including the snake-worshipping 'Nagas' of tradition.

(3) A faint Nordic element, evidenced by an occasional 'throw back' of a fair skinned light-eyed type. Richards also believed that "the Aryan influence was far more 'Cultural' than 'Racial', and that even the 'Cultural' influence was far less than is generally supposed, for there is good reason to believe that most of the characteristic features of Brahmanism and the caste system are either of the pure Dravidian (i.e. Mediterranean) origin, or else the direct outcome of the impact of the Nordic hordes on the indigenous cultures. Buddhism, at least, was admittedly a revolt of the masses against the priestly classes, and Buddhism has exerted a vast influence on post-Buddhist Hinduism.

In the following matters, Richards has suggested agreement and connexions between the Dravidian and the Mediterranean peoples and cultures: (A) Some common *motifs* in Folk Tales; (B) the Doctrine of Metempsychosis, or Rebirth, definitely not Indo-European, but probably Mediterranean in origin, inherited by both India and Greece (Pythagoras, elder contemporary of Buddha); (C) Nomenclature in Family—the grandson being named after the grand-father; (D) the Art of Writing—some symbols in pre-historic writing in India showing resemblance and affinity with Etruscan, Cretan and Proto-Egyptian writing, for example; (E) some common points in Religious Notions and Ritual—e.g. in (i) the Worship of the

Village Gods, with communal animal sacrifice and ritual dress of leaves for women votaries, (ii) Worship of Wells and the ritual connected with it, which in some cases has survived even in Britain as a pre-Indo-European (Mediterranean) heritage.

If we take note of the above as well as other matters of profound cultural (including religious) resemblances, agreements and affinities between the early Mediterranean people and the Indian Dravidian world, then we are forced to assume some very intimate contact and connexion between these two groups of people in fairly ancient times; and a Mediterranean-Dravidian connexion becomes not merely a possible but quite a probable and permissible conclusion.

But we are not as yet warranted in assuming, with the present state of our knowledge, any sure connexion between the ancient East Mediterranean (Aegean) language and the Proto-Dravidian speech of India; the one is virtually unknown, and the other is a working hypothesis which has not yet been reconstructed on the basis of the Old and Modern forms of the Dravidian language. Then, there is another matter which makes the problem still more complicated. It is the racial characteristics and affinities of the Tamils and other Dravidian-speakers of India. In the most recent work on the subject by Dr. Georges Olivier, Ex-professor of the Medical College at Pondicherry and now Professor of Anthropology at the Sorbonne in Paris University ("Anthropologie des Tamouls du Sud de l'Inde", published under the auspices of the "École Française d' Etrême-Orient", Paris, 1961), a very detailed anthropometric and anthropological Survey of the

Tamil-speaking (and other Dravidian) peoples has been made, with reference to the various castes which are their components. Professor Olivier takes his special stand on the skin pigmentation of the South Indian (and also the basic North Indian) peoples, whom he calls the *Melano-Indians* (the Dark or Black Indians). He admits as possible their points of agreement and contact with the Mediterranean and other peoples (particularly when we take note of their common dolichocephaly), but his main conclusions are interesting. They are inconclusive and negative, and from the point of view of physical anthropology, Professor Olivier is inclined to keep the Dravidian-speaking Melano-Indians with a Veddid (probably Australian) element as an isolated race or people.

He says (pp. 278–279 of the work mentioned above): "And now this is our conclusion : the *Melano-Indians* show themselves to be unclassifiable. They cannot be included within any (racial) frame-work known, without the risk of errors and paradoxes. But must they be classed at any price? Is it not wiser to abandon the insufficient frame-works, and to say that the Melano-Indians are neither a mixed group, nor a frontier people, nor again an intermediate race, but they are a separate group, a geographic race which might be called (following Roginski) the *South Indian Race*, with a view not to underline the blackness of the skin which would be misleading ........... Strictly speaking, one may imagine that these Melano-Indians had occupied formerly the north of India also, and they are responsible for the Indus civilisation, inspite of the fact that the character of the skulls found at Mohen-jo-Daro do not correspond with those of the present-day Tamils. The true

problem consists in finding out if one should connect the Veddids (one of the component elements of the Tamil people) with the Australian aborigines, the problem which means separating them from the Melano-Indians with whom they are related: this is the only real affinity of the Tamils. An Indian author, A. Aiyappan, has said about these tribes: *they are the flesh of our flesh*, and he seems to be very much in the right. Risley moreover was not entirely wrong in describing the primitive tribes under the same name of Dravidian.

**"One must then come to a conclusion about the individuality of the Melano-Indian or South-Indian Race and about its relationship with the Veddid Race."**

This *physical individuality of* the Dravidians, with certain agreements with the Mediterraneans (it may still be a moot-point) might be the ultimate result of a racial miscegenation and not be something basic or original as characterising a special race-type detached from the others; and particularly in this connexion we have to consider the strong cultural and other points of agreement with the Mediterraneans as noted above, which cannot otherwise be explained.

## LECTURE II

# DRAVIDIAN (II)

### 9. Striking Points of Agreement between the Dravidian and the Ancient Mediterranean Peoples.

The true Dravidians, although they may be dark, and sometimes black, are a race of long-heads, like the people of the Mediterranean race. They had certain religious notions, and it would indicate that a good deal of what we have in India as a heritage of Hinduism is largely what has been brought to India by the Dravidians as a Mediterranean race. Certain styles in the making of artifacts; the cult of the eagle or the kite which we have in both ancient Crete and in India, particularly in the figure of Garuda with legends connecting this eagle to Vishnu as his vehicle; and about the ultimate bases behind the cult of the Great Mother — Prakriti or Sakti, and the Supreme Spirit as the Great Father, Siva; — these would appear to be of Mediterranean origin ultimately.

The culture of ancient Greece is a composite, as we have been gradually finding it to be. Before the coming of the Indo-European Hellenes, who brought the ancient Greek language into the Balkans and in Greece and the islands and in Western Asia Minor, all that area was inhabited by an earlier race of people who were known to the Greeks in some cases as the 'Pelasgians'; and this older race had built up the great city-civilisation of the Eastern Mediterranean. These Pelasgians were Mediterranean in race. The Indo-European speaking Greeks were tall and blond, whereas

the Mediterranean Pelasgians, who have also been given the name of Aegeans by modern European historians and anthropologists, were long-headed, but dark-haired and of more slender build than the Indo-Europeans. Both these races possessed very fine features, with wavy hair and long or straight noses. In Greece, the blond Indo-Europeans came down into the country in slow infiltration, and they also passed from the mainland into the islands and then crossed the Aegean Sea into Asia Minor. All this was happening from the second half of the 2nd millennium B.C., say from 1500 B.C. onwards. Only as late as the beginning of the last quarter of the last (19th) century, European scholars, who had not the slightest idea of a pre-Hellenic or Pelasgian or Aegean civilisation in Greece, discovered vestiges of this civilisation on the mainland of Western Asia Minor and in Greece itself. The German Archaeologist H. Schliemann made an epoch-making discovery of Pre-Hellenic Pelasgian sites among the ruins of the old cities of Troy in Asia Minor and in Mycenae in Greece; and although they could not understand the full implication of their discoveries at first, it has now become established that there was, as the background of the Greek and Hellenic culture, which took its definite shape after 1000 B.C., an advanced city civilisation of Pelasgian origin. After Schliemann the British archaeologist Sir Arthur Evans, and following them others, have discovered ramifications of this Pelasgian culture, in Crete and elsewhere. Gradually it has become established that the historical civilisation of classical Greece was a composite. Here we have a racial fusion between the Pelasgian or the Aegean and the Indo-European; and there took place a racial and cultural synthesis in which the Indo-

European language of the Greeks prevailed. Already (as it has been demonstrated by Ventrys and Chadwick) in the 14th century B.C. a kind of Primitive Greek had been established in Mycenae and in Crete: unquestionably it was in use side by side with the earlier Pelasgian or Aegean language. The material culture was fundamentally that of the pre-Indo-European people. In their religious notions, there was a fair admixture of Indo-European beliefs and cults with those current among the Aegean people. The Indo-European ancestors of the Greeks brought with them the worship of the Gods who lived in the sky (the *theoi ouranioi*) and who were just anthropomorphised forces of nature — like *Dyeus Pətēr (Greek *Zeus Patēr*, Sanskrit *Dyauṣ Pitar*), like * Plateia Mātēr or Gā (Sanskrit *Pṛthvī Mātā*, and Greek *Gē* or *Gaia*), like *Suwelios (Sanskrit *Suvar-*, *Svar-*, *Sūr-ya*, and Greek *Hēlios*), like *Ausōs (Sanskrit *Uṣās*, Greek *Ēōs*) and like Fire and Wind and Rain, for which religious concepts the Greeks did not always preserve the primitive Indo-European names. These Gods were later on known as the Olympian Gods of Greek Mythology. In contrast with these Heavenly Gods, the Aegeans worshipped primarily the great Mother Goddess who was the source of all life, and this Mother Goddess had a male counterpart who was more or less a passive figure beside the very active personality of the Mother Goddess. They also worshipped the Hidden Powers of Nature which were established underground, and in later Greek Mythology the Underground Gods and Goddesses (the *theoi khthonioi*), those who lived inside the earth, are believed to have come from the Pelasgians. In any case, there was in this way a very thorough fusion between the two peoples and their

cultures, with the Indo-European Greek language as its vehicle. As a result, that wonderful composite in the history of human civilisation — the Ancient Classical Civilisation of Greece, from about 800 B.C. onwards, came into being. The Greek language of the Indo-Europeans persisted, but it was modified through its contact with the pre-Indo-European Pelasgian language. But the language of the ancient Greeks remained essentially Indo-European—only in the matter of its sound-system it suffered from some pre-Indo-European modifications; and it is a very strange thing, that the number of words from the earlier language which were adopted into the Indo-European speech was comparatively small. We have near about a dozen common words of Aegean origin in ancient Greek; but it is just likely that there were many more.

### 10. Parallels presented by Greece and India in the matter of Fusion of Indo-European and Pre-Indo-European.

What happened in ancient Greece appears also to have taken place in ancient India, though on a much larger scale. In Greece and in the Islands as well as in Asia Minor, we have (as it would appear) only two races—the Indo-European, and the Pelasgian or Aegean. But in India we have the case of at least four races, and it may be that there were one or two more of whom we have lost all traces. There was in the first instance the Austric people, now represented in their unmixed state by the Kol or Munda *Ādivāsī* peoples of India. Then there were the Mongoloid people who were concentrated in Assam and in the Himalayan slopes, although they penetrated deep into the plains of India as well. Then the third people were the Dravidians; and finally we have the Indo-Aryans who belonged to the same racial

and linguistic group as the ancient Hellenes, viz. that of the Indo-European, the oldest forms of which Indo-European speech are found as Vedic Sanskrit and the very closely connected ancient Greek.

Did the ancient Indian peoples know all these four races by distinct names? There is evidence that they did. In the first instance, we find these four names which could be distinctly laid down as referring to respectively the Austrics (Kols or Mundas), the Mongoloids, the Dravidians, and the Aryans—viz. *Niṣāda, Kirāta, Dāsa* (or *Dasyu*, or *Śūdra*), and *Ārya*. The fullest and completest identification of all the ancient Indian names for the Dravidians with the Dravidians proper is still a moot point to some extent. But we are on the whole quite in clear light in the matter of the identification of these ancient Indian names. The English historian of Ancient India, who was the pioneer in a properly scientific interpretation of our *Purāṇa* traditions, F. E. Pargiter, was of opinion that in the Puranas, the Austrics were known as the *Saudyumnas* (the descendants of Sudyumna), the Dravidians as *Mānavas*, and the Aryans as *Ailas*. Behind these Puranic names, we have the story of a complete racial fusion among the upper classes of the composite Hindu people of these originally distinct basic racial elements—Austric, Dravidian, Mongol and Aryan. The Purana tradition totally ignores, unknowingly or deliberately, the various separate racial elements in India, and they are all lumped together as components of a common group of Indian inhabitants who were already members of a single divinely ordained human family or society in which each group, with a particular caste label, had its own recognised place in the society.

### 11. Dravidian and Mediterranean: the Equation—Tamizh - *Damizha - Damila -*Dramizha - Dramila - Dravida - Dramida – Trmmili - Termilai.

Aegean and Indo-European in Greece: while we have Austric, Mongoloid, Dravidian and Aryan in India: these are the basic peoples who by their fusion gave rise to the ancient Greek people and to the ancient Hindus. So far as Greece is concerned, they have been able to find very little vestiges of the language of the Aegeans or Pelasgians, and no trace or remnant of the Aegean speech has been preserved now. The Aegean languages or dialects were widely current in parts of Asia Minor, in the Islands of the Eastern Mediterranean, and in Greece. Some of the place-names in ancient Greece show remnants of this old language—particularly names which ended in the affix *-inthos* or *-yns*. Inscriptions have been found in some of the languages of Asia Minor. Excepting for Phrygian, which is Indo-European and related to the ancient Greek, most of these Asia Minor languages, or "Asianic Languages" as they are called, like Carian, Lycian and Lydian, do not appear to show any connexion with the Indo-European, with ancient Greek or ancient Phrygian. Of course in the hinterland of Asia Minor, in company with a large number of non - Indo-European languages, the Hittite language (or Kanisian) has been discovered in a long series of inscriptions. One of the greatest achievments of Modern Linguistics has been the identification, round about 1917–1920, of this Hittite language as being connected with Indo-European, and this was the achievement of the Czechoslovak Linguistic Scholar and Archaeologist B. Hrozny'. This is a very specialised branch of archaeology, linguistics and

philology, with which the Dravidian problem is certainly intimately connected, if we accept the conclusions of James Hornell and others. But only the broad findings of this specialised research we can take note of. In the island of Crete have been found, right down to the middle of the first millennium B. C., inscriptions in the Greek alphabet of a language which is quite different from Greek, and this is known as the language of the 'Eteocretans' or the early pre-Hellenic Cretan people; in other words, we have here some late specimens of the Pelasgian or Aegean language as current in Crete before the full establishment of the Indo-European ancient Greek. Herodotus in his history has mentioned that the Eteocretans, or the original pre-Hellenic people of Crete, used to call themselves *Termilai*. There is also a tradition that the people of Lycia in Asia Minor are a branch of the people of Crete—the Lycians and the Cretans are two distinct groups of the same people. A number of Lycian inscriptions have been found in Asia Minor in an alphabet allied to the Greek, but we have not been able to get at the full meaning of these inscriptions. But the sense of a number of words has been arrived at. Here also, therefore, we have some words and phrases in the pre-Indo-European Pelasgian language. If the genuine and original Dravidians, before they became much mixed up with other peoples on their way to India and in India itself and became present-day Dravidians, came from the Mediterranean area and were a non-Indo-European people, it would be only reasonable to think that the language they brought to India was, in spite of many changes it underwent in the way and subsequently in India, was fundamentally the language of the Pelasgians or Aegeans; and among these Pelasgians or Aegeans

were the Lycians and the Cretans whom we can correctly place in their linguistic set-up. The Eteocretans as an Aegean people called themselves *Termilai*; and in the Lycian inscriptions, the Lycian people described themselves as *Trm̄mili*. So *Termilai* and *Trm̄mili* are different forms of the same name, which can be looked upon as being originally the name of one of the tribes or groups of this people which subsequently was extended for the whole people or a considerable part of it. This at once draws our attention to the earlier forms of the name *Tamil*. *Tamil* is the form in which we find the name at the present day (*Tamizh*). There is no doubt that round about the time of Christ this name was heard by the Greeks and the people of Ceylon as **Damizh* or **Damizha*, for the Greeks wrote this name in their own language as *Damir-* (as in *Damir̥kē* = *Tamizhakam*), and the ancient Sinhalese as *Damiḷa*. We are forced to attempt a connexion of this form, **Damizha*, with the Sanskrit *Dramiḍa* and *Draviḍa*, which goes back in India to Sanskrit documents of about the middle of the first millennium A. D. It is indeed exceedingly likely that the common source form in India of these two parallel forms–Tamil =* *Damizh–Tamizh* and Sanskrit *Dramiḍa–Draviḍa*, was, in the Primitive Dravidian of India of about 1000 or 1500 B C., something like **Dramizha*. Can we not therefore be justified in postulating this equation—

*Tamizh* - **Damizha* – *Damiḷa* – **Dramizha* – *Dramiḷa* – *Dramiḍa* – *Draviḍa* – *Tr̥m̄mili* – *Termilai* ?

Here, of course, *Dramiḍa* and *Draviḍa* refer specifically not to the whole family of the Dravidian people but to a single group of people who were the ancestors

of just the Tamilians, as there was a lack of a generic and all-inclusive name.

This suggestion was put forward by me in 1924 (in the *Modern Review* of Calcutta) when the Mohen-jo-Daro discoveries, as first made by the late Rakhal Das Banerji, and later taken over by the Archæological Department of India and brilliantly investigated by Sir John Marshall, first came to the lime-light. I ventured at that time to suggest that a few words found in the ancient Lycian inscriptions of the middle of the first millennium B.C. had their possible equivalents in the Dravidian and other Indian languages. These words are: Lycian *xupa* (here *x*=spirant *kh*) 'cave', cf. Sanskrit *guhā* from **gubhā*, Hindi *gophā*; Lycian *prñnawate* ='built, excavated, carved, inscribed', cf. Telugu *vrā*, Kannada *brā* 'write' ('scratch'); Lycian *Trqqas* 'a goddess', cf. Sanskrit *Durgā*; besides *Trm̃mili*=*Dramiḍa*, **Dramizha*. In these suggested equations, there is one significant regularity -- Lycian has a surd stop+*r* (*tr*, *pr*) where the corresponding Indian forms show the corresponding sonant+*r* (*dr*, *br* or *vr*). My idea was in this way to trace (or rather to suggest) a connexion between Primitive Dravidian of India and the ancient Aegean language, which, according to the implications of these anthropological and ethnological findings, was a sister if not the mother of the former.

The above were just a few suggestions for a possible connexion between Dravidian and the ancient language of the Mediterranean (Pelasgian or Aegean) people of the Greek main-land and the Islands, and Asia Minor. Considering the Mediterranean affinities of the Dravidians, other scholars have pushed the enquiry, and a

few more lexical affinities have been suggested. Dr. Hermann Berger of Heidelberg (now visiting Professor of Linguistics in the Government Sanskrit College in Calcutta) has kindly drawn my attention to at least three words which have been explained as survivals from the ancient Eastern Mediterranean speech occuring in Dravidian. These are —

(1) The word for leguminous plants as well as (by narrowing of the sense) for the green gram: Tamil *payar'u*, Malayalam *payar'(u)*, Kannada *pesar'*, Telugu *pesara*, *pesalu* = 'green gram'; Kolami *pesal*, Naiki *pesaḷ*, Gondi *peśel* (with these may be compared Tamil *paca* 'to be green, turn sallow or pale, become golden as the sky in the evening', with quite a long series of words in other Dravidian languages, seemingly cognate and meaning 'greenness, verdure, moisture' mossy', etc. Connexion of these has been suggested with the Greek *phaseolos* 'peas, lentils, beans'. The Dravidian series of words and the Greek word may very well be both from the same ancient East Mediterranean word, not attested.

(2) The word for 'oil' and for the 'sesamum' as the source of oil: Tamil *eḷ*, *eṇ* 'sesamum' (*eṇ ney* = 'sesamum oil', Malayalam *eḷ*, *eḷḷu*, Telugu *eṇme* 'gingelly oil seed', *eṇṇe* 'oil'. Compare the common European word for *oil* in the Eastern Mediterranean — Greek *elaia* (< *elaiwa-) 'olive tree', *elaion* 'olive', Latin *oliva* 'olive', *oleum* 'oil', from an East Mediterranean word.

(3) The Greek word *phoiniks* means, among other things, 'the date palm', a 'palm tree', 'the fronds of the palm (which were made into crowns of victory)', and besides 'a kind of grass'. This has been compared with Dravidian words to mean 'to plait, braid, knit, weave, entwine', etc., like Tamil *pin'n'u*, *pin'n'i* 'to braid', *pin'n'al* 'matted hair', *pin'n'ai* 'hair'. The source form in Mediterranean would

appear to have been something like **phoin*, **poin*, **pin*, the sense being connected with twisting or weaving or braiding the leaves of a tree like the palm.

To the above meagre list of three words, I would suggest adding two more, besides those from the Lycian inscriptions.

(4) The word for the 'horse': Tamil *kutirai*, Kannada *kudure*, Telugu *gurramu*, etc. With these may be compared Ancient Egyptian *ḥ-t-r*, which may very well be a Near Eastern or Mediterranean word. See in this connexion below, pp. 51, 52 of this paper. Compare also the Modern Greek *gadairos* 'donkey', Turkish *katyr*, 'mule', and New Indo-Aryan loan from an unknown source, Hindustani *khaccar* or *xaccar*, Bengali *khaccar* 'mule', probably connected with the Turkish.

(5) The word for the 'elephant': Old Tamil *peṭi*, *piṭi* 'female elephant', Assyrio-Babylonian *pīru*, Arabic *fīl*, Old Persian *pīru*, Modern Persian *pīl*, Late Sanskrit *pīlu*. These may be from a Near Eastern word, contiguous to the Mediterranean area: see below, p. 52.

All this indeed would appear to be highly speculative, and would go counter to some of our established notions. But when our knowledge of an appreciable amount of actual facts is wanting, the assumption of a hypothesis which would explain the existing or known facts in their mutual relationship is permissible. There are so many other things which would go to indicate a very deep cultural connexion, which is also in the sphere of religion, between the pre-Indo-European peoples of the Mediterranean area and pure Dravidiandom in India, as far as that can be established through linguistic and archaeological, and cultural and sociological investigation.

**12. Linguistic Palaeontology, and Proto-Dravidian Culture: the Different Dravidian Speeches — their Literatures and their Periods.**

The science of Comparative Philology has established for us the pre-historic culture of the Indo-European peoples, by means of what is known as *Linguistic Paleontology*. By comparing words from the different Indo-European languages, ancient and modern, it has been possible to arrive at a basic vocabulary of Primitive Indo-European, and this vocabulary gives us quite a good deal of information about the material surroundings and the cultural achievements as well as the social and religious notions of the Primitive Indo-Europeans. Such an attempt has not been made systematically for the Primitive Dravidians in India. To consider the situation for the Primitive Aegeans of the Mediterranean area through Linguistic Palaeontology alone would be still more difficult, and with the present state of our knowledge almost impossible to arrive at now, considering that we have not as yet been able to read the pre-Indo-European documents of the Aegean area. We have, however, through archæological remains and surviving artefacts, been able to form some legitimate conceptions of the cultural and religious world of the Aegeans. But on the basis of the various Dravidian languages which are current today and of the literary and other specimens of which go back to some 2000 years from now, it may be possible to arrive at the background for the life and culture of the Primitive Dravidians of India, in their pure and unmixed state when they were as yet free from the influence of the Indo-Aryans. Scholars of Dravidian were uptil now comparing the vocabularies in the different Dravidian languages, and the first comprehensive work

in this line has been that of the late Prof. Korada Ramakrishnayya (of the University of Madras and Annamalai University), and a work by this scholar on the subject was published by the University of Madras some time ago (*Dravidian Cognates*, 1944). The dictionaries of the different Dravidian languages, e. g. that of Kannada, by Kittel and the vocabularies of different Tamil and other Dravidian texts, also prepared the way for this kind of comparative study. But a very great advance has been made last year by the publication in 1961 from the Clarendon Press, Oxford, of the most valuable *Dravidian Etymological Dictionary* through the collaboration of two eminent Dravidianists, Prof. J. B. Emeneau of California, U.S.A., and T. Burrow of Oxford University, England. Here we have a mass of very precious and precise material relating to the *Sprachgut* of Dravidian as it is found in the different languages, and it will continue to be for years to come an inexhaustible mine to draw our materials from. After an analysis of this speech-material has made some progress, we shall be in a position to draw our conclusions on the basis of the pure Dravidian roots and words, to have a clear notion of what may be called "the Pre-historic Antiquities of the Dravidian People of India."

For our speech-material in Dravidian, we have in the first instance the modern Dravidian languages and dialects, which have been roughly classified under three heads or groups:

(1) The Southern, which is the most important, including the four great culture-languages—Telugu, Kannada, Tamil and Malayalam, besides Tulu, Toda and a few others;

(2) The Central Group, consisting of the dialects of Gondi, of Kandh or Kui, Oraon or Kurukh, Maler, and a number of dialects in Orissa and Madhya Pradesh, like Parji and Ollari, which have recently come to light; and

(3) The North-Western Group, represented by Brahui.

**13. Materials for the Study of *Old* and Primitive Dravidian in India.**

Excepting for the four cultivated languages, the material presented by the other speeches is very recent—they belong to the 19th and 20th centuries. But their linguistic importance is by no means to be belittled. With regard to the four cultivated Dravidian languages, Tamil has the oldest specimens, which may partly go back to the centuries immediately preceding Christ. But here also there is a certain amount of doubt and controversy. One, of course, cannot take into serious consideration the view which would take back the antiquity of Tamil literature to an impossibly early age like 5000 B.C. The bulk of early Tamil literature, in what may be described as the Old Tamil period, belongs to the age from about the 3rd to the 12th century A.D.; and the oldest strata of this Old Tamil literature go back to the first six centuries after Christ. This is the Golden Age of the *Sangam* Classics, and this was followed by the age of the Nayanmars and the Azhvars, together with other classics continuing the literary tradition of the *Sangam* era, until we come down to Middle Tamil from about the middle of the 14th century. Nevertheless, here we have a very important mass of material for the study of Old Dravidian, and even Primitive Dravidian. Apart from these literary

remains in Old Tamil, we have to take note also of the early inscriptions in Old Tamil the earliest of which goes back to about 400 A. D. (the Tirunathar - kundra inscription from South Arcot District, near Jinji). Then there is the case of the Brahmi inscriptions found in the South Tamil country, and the Arikamedu pottery fragment inscriptions, the first being taken to the 3rd century B.C. and the second to about the same period, though possibly a little later. Here we have a number of small inscriptions, the nature of the language of which is exceedingly doubtful. Some words look like a very debased or advanced sort of Prakrit, and others look like some kind of Old Tamil. It may be that it is an incomplete system of writing, and the actual writing does not represent the current pronunciation or form of the language. This is all the oldest material available from the Tamil side. The Malayalam, as is well known, is an off-shoot of Old Tamil, and, like the modern Tamil dialects the present-day Malayali dialects equally converge back to *Sangam* Tamil. Still, there are some early Malayalam inscriptions before 1300 A. D. and Malayalam compositions a little after this period, which have their value for historical Dravidian studies. Then we have Kannada, which has a very copious literature both in inscriptions as well as in written books—the inscriptions going back to about 450 A. D. and being continued right down to late mediaeval times. The literature of Kannada goes back to about the 9th century A. D. There is the case of the problematical passage in ancient Kannada which was declared by the archaeological scholar E. Hultzsch to be Kannada of the 3rd century A. D., found in some fragments of a papyrus manuscript of a Greek drama discovered in Northern Egypt—the Oxyrrhincus Papyrus Fragments,

in which we find a scene where an Indian Prince in South India is talking in some Indian language, and this Indian language was explained by Hultzsch as being a form of Old Kannada. But some of the more careful scholars of Kannada, who speak the language as their mother-tongue, have expressed their doubts as to this language being genuine Ancient Kannada. However, we may say that next to the evidence of Tamil the most important is that as presented by the Kannada language. After this we have the materials presented by the Telugu. The oldest literature so far extant which we find in Telugu is the adaptation of the *Mahābhārata* by Nannaya Bhatta of the 11th century A.D. But before that, we have a series of Old Telugu inscriptions, commencing from the middle of the 7th century A. D Thus the above present the earliest documents of Dravidian in India, and they are between 2000 to 1500 years old.

Then there is another class of material for the study of Old Dravidian, and this should be much more closely looked into than before. These are the Dravidian borrowings registered by Sanskrit literature from the Vedas onwards. The antiquity of the Rig-Veda has been taken back to 4th millennium B.C. by some scholars, and generally it is believed that the Vedas belong to about 2000 B. C. But a sober estimate, to which the present writer subscribes, would bring down the age of the Vedic literature to a period between 1500 to 900 B.C. — 1500 B.C. roundly indicating the period from which the Aryan - speakers began to come to India with a very early form of the Vedic speech as their spoken language and also as the language of their songs and ballads and their religious

hymns. Round about 1000 B.C. would be the heyday of Vedic literature, though towards its close: the 10th century B.C. being in all likelihood the period of the *Mahābhārata* story in its historical core, and the age of the *floruit* of the historical heroes and heroines of the *Mahābhārata*, including Vyasa, who is accredited with the collection as well as compilation of the four Veda books, as much as with the compilation of the first *Purāṇas* and of the original *Mahābhārata*. From the Rig-Veda onwards we have a number of words which are embedded in Sanskrit, both Vedic and Classical; and these words have Dravidian affinities. In subsequent Sanskrit literature we have further similar words, and they have been studied on comparative lines with the words from the various Dravidian languages. Kittel in the Introduction to his Kannada Dictionary has given about 450 common words of Sanskrit which have a Dravidian affinity. This number is now on the increase, other scholars also identifying other Sanskrit words as being really of Dravidian origin. We are therefore justified in saying that a very valuable amount of speech-material for Ancient Dravidian is presented by these Dravidian loan-words in Sanskrit, particularly in books which go back to times before Christ; and these would, as it can well be conceived, supplement the materials available from the study of native Dravidian sources. The phonology of these Dravidian loans in Sanskrit has a very great importance in arriving at the sound-system of Primitive Dravidian in India; since, because they are old borrowings from Dravidian, they are expected to preserve in many cases an older form of a Dravidian word which may occur even in the older stages of Tamil, Kannada and Telugu. In this connexion I have suggested

(following my *guru* the late Professor Jules Bloch of Paris) that the existence of voiced stop consonants *initially* (which, according to the views of a good many scientific investigators of Dravidian, historically and linguistically, did not exist in Primitive Dravidian) appears to be supported by some of these old Dravidian borrowings in Sanskrit. Take, for example, a word like Sanskrit *garu-ḍa*, 'eagle' or 'Vishnu's eagle', beside Tamil *kazhu*; Sanskrit *garda-bha* 'ass' or 'donkey' = Telugu *gaḍide*, Tamil *kazhutai;* Sanskrit *galva* or *galla* 'a stone vessel', beside Tamil *kal* 'stone', etc. Words like these would suggest, as evidence of the Dravidian borrowings in Sanskrit, the occurrence of intitial voiced stops in Primitive Dravidian of 2500 years and more ago.

**14. Linguistic Palaeontology on the basis of Old Tamil.**

Relying entirely on Tamil, Robert Caldwell, the pioneer investigator of the Dravidian languages, tried to give a picture of Primitive Dravidian Civilisation in India, independent of the Indo-Aryan; and following him, we might give a sort of a re-construction, although to a very meagre extent, of the Pre-historic Antiquity of Dravidiandom. Thus—the Dravidians had 'kings' among them, and a king was called *kō* or *vēntan'* or *mannaṉ'*. The kings lived in fortified palaces called *koṭṭai* or *aran*, and they used to rule over the different *nāṭu-s* or 'states or provinces'. The kings were attended by their 'bards' or 'panegyrists;' *puḷavan'*, who used to sing their *ceyyul* or 'songs or poems' on festive days (*koṇṭaṭṭam* or *tiravizha*). The Dravidians were acquainted with the art of writing, called by them *ezhuttu* or *vrā* or *brā*). They used to do their 'writing' (*varai*) by means of an iron 'stylus' (*iraku*) with which

they used to scratch the palm-leaves and with a bundle of palm-leaves they would prepare a 'book' (*eṭu*). Although they used to worship various Gods and Goddesses, they were cognisant of One Supreme God, whom they called *kō* i.e. 'King', and they believed in this Supreme God living in temples *kō-v-il* or *kō-y-il*, which meant really 'a palace'. They had their 'customs' and 'customary laws' (*kaṭṭalai*, *pazhakkam*), but we do not hear of 'judges' or 'lawyers' among them. In the Old Tamil unmixed with Sanskrit we find the names for 'gold' (*pon'*), 'silver' (*veḷḷi*), 'copper' (*cempu*) and 'iron' (*irumpu*). But they appear not to have been familiar with 'tin', 'lead' and 'zinc'. Among the heavenly bodies, they appear not to have been familiar with all the seven planets which we find in the Indo-Aryan world, borrowed latterly from the Chaldæan and Greek astronomy, No Old Tamil words for 'Mercury' and 'Saturn' are found. But they had names for 'Mars' (*Cevvay*), 'Venus' (*Veḷḷi*) and 'Jupiter' (*Viyāzham*). They had 'towns' which they called *ūr*, and they knew of different kinds of 'boats' like *toṇī*, *oṭam* and *vallam*, and even 'ships' (*kappal*, *paṭavu*) by which they would cross the sea. But from the evidence of Old Tamil, it would appear that they were not acquainted with any 'island' — evidently they were not accustomed to travel over the sea in the oldest period of their history. They were expert agriculturists (*vēlanmai* 'agriculture', *ēr* 'plough'). They were quite a war-like people, and in their battles they used 'bows' (*vil*), 'arrows' (*ampu*). 'swords' (*vāḷ*) and 'lances' (*vēḷ*). They had a number of arts and crafts among them, for they had words for 'spinning' and 'weaving', 'dyeing', 'blacksmith's work' and 'pottery'.

The above picture was painted by Caldwell over a hundred years ago. Subsequently, a very painstaking study of the cultural vocabulary of Old Tamil has been made by the late Prof. P. T. Srinivasa Ayyangar in his very valuable work *Pre-Aryan Tamil Culture* published by the University of Madras in 1930.

**15. Dravidian Influence on Aryan.**

The matter of the Dravidian loan-words in Sanskrit is unquestionably one of the most important subjects, not only in Indian Linguistics as a whole, but also in the history of cultural diffusion and inter-action within India. Already in the Vedic speech there are certain instances of Dravidian influence. The cerebral or retroflex sounds of Indo-Aryan are generally believed to be the result of Dravidian influence on Indo-Aryan, although it is not unlikely that these sounds, which did not exist in Primitive Indo-European, developed in Indo-Aryan quite independently of any Dravidian influence — as they have done in Swedish and other forms of Indo-European in the Germanic world outside India. Yet the proximity of of the Dravidian speeches (and also of the Austric ones, which appear to have possessed these sounds from the very beginning) is a strong argument in favour of Indo-Aryan having borrowed these sounds from Dravidian (or it may be Austric — or from both). There is the solitary instance of the Scandinavian languages, Swedish and Norwegian, where within recent centuries the retroflex or cerebral *ṭ* and *ḍ* originated from earlier *r* plus *t*, and *r* plus *d*. In Indo-Aryan the development of the cerebrals in the first instance, when it was derivative cerebralisation, was along similar lines: only in all these cases it was *l* plus *t* and *l* plus *d* (and *l* plus

*th* and *l* plus *ḍh*, as well as *l* plus *n* and *l* plus *s*), which gave rise to the cerebrals, according to Fortunatov's Law. This was evidently before the change of the liquid sound *l* of Primitive Indo-European into *r* in all cases in some of the dialects of Indo-Aryan. After that we have the case of *r* plus *t(h)* and *r* plus *d(h)* giving rise to cerebral modifications, *ṭ* (*h*) and *ḍ* (*h*); and the evidence of the Eastern Prakrit, which had only *l* (and no *r*), and went in for a very large-scale cerebralisation, would go to show a continuation in India of the old pre-Indo-Aryan habit of changing dentals to cerebrals when they were preceded by *l*. This is a technical matter which I discussed long ago in my *Origin and Development of the Bengali Language* (Calcutta 1926, Vol. I, pp. 483 ff.). The question of the cerebral sounds apart, possibly the loss of the spirant sounds like *z*, *zh* as well as of the guttural, dental and labial spirants, might have been due to Dravidian influence. There has not been a very close comparison of Dravidian syntax with that of Vedic, but here one may feel sure that there has been some Dravidian influence. Then there is the case of words which show what is known as *Spontaneous Cerebralisation*—dentals changing to cerebrals without the influence of any contiguous sound like *l* or *r*. Further, as the centuries pass, we find a larger and larger number of words cropping up in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan which show the cerebral, and which also have Dravidian affinities. All this becomes clear for us when we consider the background of Dravidian behind the Aryan speech in India as a substratum underlying the latter. In the Vedic language itself, we have a number of very common words which have relations or affinities with Dravidian: e. g. *aṇu*, *araṇi*,

*kapi, karmāra, kāla, kalā, kitava, kūṭa, kuṇara, gaṇā, nānā, nīla, puṣpa, puṣkara, pūjā* and the root *pūj, phala, bila, bīja, rātri, sāyam;* as well as words found in later Vedic literature as in the Brahmanas like *aṭavī, āḍambara, khaḍga, taṇḍula, maṭacī, valakṣa* and *vallī.* These words are on the increase as we proceed further in Classical Sanskrit and the Prakrits, down to the time of the Bhashas or New Indo-Aryan Vernaculars. The Dravidian and other pre-Aryan elements in Indo-Aryan have drawn the attention of all investigators, and the work of the previous scholars in this line has been already mentioned.

Influence of Dravidian (and other non-Aryan) on Aryan—this is but one side of the shield, which was until recently neglected or lost sight of. But the other side is there too—the influence of Aryan in the development of Dravidian. This has been far-reaching and wide, as well as profound. A mere study of Sanskrit and Prakrit and other loan-words from Aryan into the Dravidian languages will be enough to show its nature and extent—in vocabulary. We may mention a monograph of capital importance like that of S. Anavaratavinayakam Pillai on the Sanskrit Loan-Words in Tamil, as published in the *Madras University Dravidian Studies*, and works on the Sanskrit loan-words in other Dravidian languages. For 2000 years and more, this influencing of Dravidian by Aryan has been going on: and although some ancient Tamil writers were conscious of their Tamil heritage in language and literary style, they were impressed and influenced profoundly by Aryan, none the less. Through these loans in Tamil and other Dravidian, and through grammatical and syntactical influences, as well as through the presence of

common subject-matters in literature, Sanskrit and Dravidian became interwoven in the Indian scene. So much so that an illustrious Tamil Saiva teacher had declared that "the nature of Tamil will not be clear to those who have not learned Sanskrit" (*Vaḍanūl unarndarkkanrit Tamizh iyalpu vilaṅgadu:* Sivajnana-Munivar, commentary to the *Tolkāppiyam*, Ezhutt'ati-kāram, *Sūtra* 1, as quoted in the Government of India Sanskrit Commission's Report, 1958, p. 85).

Sanskrit happened to be the only great language with which Dravidian came in intimate contact in ancient as well as medieval times in India, and Sanskrit was the vehicle of a great composite culture, the creation of the Aryans and the non-Aryans (including large contributions from the Dravidians) jointly. Hence it was only natural that Dravidian should have the deep impress of Sanskrit; and to ignore this, including the presence of a large modified Sanskrit element in *Sangam* Tamil and other ancient Dravidian cultivated tongues, would be both negation of science on the one hand and doubtful patriotism on the other.

**16. Conclusion: Dravidian and Aryan, the Two Main Bases of the Composite Culture of India.**

One thing I would like to reiterate in this connexion. There cannot be any conception of India without either Dravidian (and other pre-Aryan) or Aryan. Like the warp and woof of a piece of woven stuff, Aryan and Dravidian have become interlaced with each other to furnish the texture of Indian civilisation. It would be quite an impossible thing to separate the two from each other in present-day Indian life and Indian culture, in the Indian way of thinking and the

Indian way of living. As said before, even in the formation of Sanskrit, there has been a very important contribution from Dravidian and other non-Aryan; and the glories of Sanskrit literature are the result of the joint labours of not only speakers of Aryan but also of speakers of Dravidian. The finishing touches to Indian civilisation and culture and thought were given by the Dravidian-speaking peoples of the South. The contribution of the South in these matters has all along been tacitly acknowledged. It has been said, and quite correctly, that if some of the *sūtras* or main prose aphorisms, i.e. the basic concepts, came from the North (which was already the result of the commingling of Aryan and Dravidian), the *bhāṣyas* i.e. the commentaries or practical application of them came from the South. The North contributed ritualism without any profound spiritual and mystic approach, but the deeper and more universal things like *Yōga* and *Bhakti* came from the pre-Aryan background. The Mohen-jo-Daro seals show men seated in the *Yōga* posture, and at least one seal gives the earliest picture of Ūrdhvaliṅga Virūpākṣa Paśupati Śiva. Pre-Aryan magical and religious notions, rituals, mythology, mysticism and thought became established in the Indian Brahmanical world, although the basic words for these were in Sanskrit (possibly as renderings from the pre-Aryan language), for Sanskrit became the universally accepted vehicle of this composite Indian (i. e. Aryan-*cum*-non-Aryan) world. The common Sanskrit *ślōka* (in its various readings) testifies to the acceptance by most Indians of the great fact of *Bhakti* or Devotion to the Supreme coming from the Tamil country (in the early centuries after Christ) and permeating

more or less profoundly the whole of Indian religion thought during the last 2000 years:

*utpannā Drāviḍē Bhaktir,*

*vṛddhiṃ Karṇāṭakē gatā;*

*Andhra-dēśē kvacit-kvacid,*

*Gūrjarē vilayaṃ gatā.*

When we study the great literature of *Bhakti* which in the compositions of the Saiva saints, the Nayanmars, and of the Vaishnava saints, the Azhvars, of the Tamil-nad, or Tamizhakam or Dramiḍa-dēśa proper, which came into existence during the second half of the first millennium A.D., we can appreciate the truth of the statement made in the above *ślōka.* Art, particularly plastic art, as well as dance and the drama, were among the great contributions of the Primitive Dravidians to the world of Indian culture.

The Dravidian heritage belongs not to the speakers of the Dravidian languages alone, but it is equally an inheritance of those who speak the Aryan language, because the latter are very largely in their blood, in their culture, in their religion, and in their way of life the same as the people of the South.

The ancestors of the Indo-Aryans, namely, the Primitive Indo-Europeans, are credited with the taming of the horse, and they early developed a word to mean the 'horse', which was **ekwos* in Primitive Indo-European. This word became in Sanskrit *aśva* (*aspa* in Avestan, *asa* in Old Persian), *aśva* ('mare') in Baltic, and it occurs in Greek as *hippos* (from an earlier **ikkwos*), Gothic *aihwa-* (*exwa*), Old English *eh*, *eoh*, Irish *ech*, Latin *equus* and Tokharian *yakwe*. But it is rather strange that

in India the Aryans adopted a local word, which is found in Sanskrit as *ghōṭa* or *ghōṭaka* and in Modern Indo-Aryan languages like Hindi as *ghōḍā*. Evidently, before the Aryans came to India, the local people were already acquainted with the horse. This word *ghōḍā*, Sanskrit *ghōṭaka*, is very likely a Prakritic development, adopted in Sanskrit itself, of an earlier form **ghutra* or **ghotra*, and this is the word which unquestionably is also the ultimate source of Tamil *kutirai*, Kannada *kudure* and Telugu *gurra-mu* (from an earlier **gudra-m*). The question becomes interesting when we consider the place of the horse in the culture of the Primitive Indo-Europeans and in the culture of the other peoples like the pre-Aryan peoples of India. The hypothetical reconstruction of **ghutra* can be easily connected with the ancient Egyptian word *ḥ-t-r*, which meant a horse or a draught animal, and the Egyptians got the horse from peoples from Mesopotamia and Syria, or the Aegean people—it did not originally belong to the Nile Valley. There is again the modern Greek word *gadairos*, meaning 'a donkey' and the Turkish word *katyr* meaning 'a mule'. The Primitive Dravidian language evidently furnished the source-form of the Modern Indo-Aryan *ghōḍā* and Modern Dravidian *kudirai, kudure, gurramu* etc. An interesting problem in cultural history therefore arises out of this. Then, again, in the matter of that other important animal connected with Indian civilisation—the elephant, the Sanskrit names for the elephant, excepting the descriptive names, *hastin* or *karin* (meaning 'the animal with the hand'), are of pre-Aryan origin, like *airāvata, karēṇu, mātaṅga, gaja, pīlu* etc. Who were the first people in India to tame the elephant — the Austrics, or the Dravidians ? A close study of the special words used all over India by the *mahouts* perhaps will give us

some important data. A semantic study of these Dravido-Aryan words will be of very great value in appraising the cultural relations between the speakers of Primitive Dravidian and the speakers of Old Indo-Aryan and their descendants, and it will enable us to get a clear conception of the Primitive Dravidian world in India *vis-à-vis* that of the Old Indo-Aryan.

The problem of Dravidian is thus one of pan-Indian importance, and it does not concern the speakers of the Dravidian languages alone. Here there is ample scope for co-operation between scholars of the Indo-Aryan and scholars of the Dravidian languages. Fortunately, a great scholarly tradition in this line has already been built up by the scholars of the South, who were equally at home in both Sanskrit on the one hand, and Tamil or Malayalam, Kannada or Telugu on the other. We can mention eminent personalities like V. V. Swaminatha Ayyar, S. V. Damodaram Pillai, P.T. Srinivasa Ayyangar, J. M. Nallaswami Pillai, K. V. Subbayya, P. S. Subrahmanya Ayyar, S. Vaiyapuri Pillai, K. and R. A. Narasimhacharya, K. Ramakrishnayya, L.V. Ramaswami Ayyar and others; and serious workers of the present generation in South India are carrying on and extending this great tradition. In this context, we have to express our grateful appreciation of the services rendered by the *pathi-kritas* or path-finders from Europe, who have been our masters and teachers in this subject of vital interest for us– *viz.* scholars like F. Max Mueller, Robert Caldwell, H. Gundert, F. Kittel, G. U. Pope, Julien Vinson, Jules Bloch and others of the generations that have joined the majority, and their successors both in India and abroad like the late P. Meile, F.B.J. Kuiper, A. Master, T. Burrow,

J. B. Emeneau, T. N. Sreekantaiya, A. N. Narasimhayya, G. S. Gai, P. Subramoniam, Bh. Krishnamurti, K. Mahadeva Sastri, K. M. George, S. Chandrasekhara, K. Kanapathi Pillai, Kamil Zvelebil and others — fortunately for us, a growing band, in India and Ceylon and in Europe and America. An interest in as well as an attention to the Philology of Dravidian (using the term *Philology* in its earlier sense, which is still current on the continent, in German and French for example, meaning the study, not only of a language in itself and in its history and development, but also of the literature composed in it and of the culture-world of which this literature is an expression) is still something to come from the Indo-Aryan speakers in North and in Central India. This is awaited with hope and eagerness by all who believe in the basic Unity of India. When this desideratum is reached in the domain of all-India linguistic and literary studies, then alone it will be possible to find an interpretation of many of the problems, linguistic and cultural, historical and philosophical, and scientific and humanistic, posed by the word *Dravidian.*

---

# LECTURE III

## THE "MATTER OF DRĀVIḌA-DĒŚA OR TIRAVIḌA-NĀḌU" IN SOUTH INDIAN LITERATURES

### 1. Indo-Aryan Literature: Old, Middle and New.

India has a literary output which is over 3,000 years old. From the time that the "Indian Man" was born through a fusion of Aryan and non-Aryan in the late Vedic period (as has been expressed in a most significant manner by the late Prof. F.W. Thomas), there has been a continuous and unabated history of literary composition in all the Indian languages (beginning with Vedic Sanskrit) as and when they began to develop and to take definite shape. We have within the Aryan language-family in India, first the literature of the Vedas, which is the oldest we have in India. It was about the middle of the 10th century B. C. that an Indian sage, Kṛishṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa, began to get together the masses of religious hymns and ritualistic literature in Vedic Sanskrit, which were current among the Aryan speakers of his time. All this mass of hymns to their Gods and Goddesses, and quite a good few relating to social and political conditions as well as to mysticism and philosophy, were collected and then arranged or classified by Kṛishṇa Dvaipāyana into 3 (or 4) main compilations – the *Ṛig-Vēda*, the *Yajur-Vēda* and the *Sāma-Vēda* (the fourth compilation being the *Atharva-Vēda*). In this way, the basic sacred texts were furnished by Vyāsa through his redaction of the four Veda books: his epithet *Vyāsa* means 'Arranger' or 'Redactor'. This is the universally accepted tradition in the matter of the preservation and continuation

of the Vedic texts. Vyāsa is also credited with starting a movement to collect all the mythological, legendary and historical traditions of the Aryan-speaking people, relating to cosmogony and other matters and to the past kings and queens and heroes and heroines as well as to sages and saints; and these legends and stories and traditions referred not only to the God-world and the hero-world of the Aryan people, but also of the pre-Aryan peoples who came within the orbit of the Aryan language and Aryan cultural organisation. Just as Vyāsa was at the head of the various Vedic teachers and scholars with their different schools, so through a succession of his disciples, who were the first minstrels and trouvères of early Hindudom—the Purāṇa narrators, chanters or readers—like Sauti Lōma-harshaṇa, started the movement for collecting these masses of legends and stories and folk-knowledge and higher wisdom, whatever was available from among the people. In this way the "Purāṇas" in their oldest form began to be collected, and Vyāsa was also the inspirer of it. In later centuries whatever was available to later collectors in various forms of Prakrit or Middle Indo-Aryan was also rendered into Sanskrit and incorporated in the ever-increasing number of the Purāṇas, which also were getting bulkier and bulkier and wider and all-comprehensive in their scope, as the generations passed.

It is to be noted that Vyāsa, who may be said in a way to be the real inaugurator of Brahmanism by giving to a new religion, which was taking shape among a mixed people of Aryan and non-Aryan (Dravidian, Austric and Mongoloid) origin and which was coming into being in North India towards the end of the Vedic period, its basic religious and "historical" texts — the Vedas

and the Purāṇas – was himself of mixed origin. Vyāsa was three-fourths non-Aryan : his mother Satyavatī or Matsya-gandhā was the daughter of a pre-Aryan (possibly Austric) chief of a fisher folk, and his father Parāśara, reputed to be a Brahman, was a half-caste, as his father Śaktri was an Aryan Brahman, while his mother Adṛiśyantī was a non-Aryan (Chaṇḍāla) woman. And Vyāsa was known as *Kṛishṇa* or "Black" because of his dark non-Aryan colour, just as he had also the sobriquet of *Dvaipāyana* as he was born on a *dvīpa* island in the Ganges.

In this way, we have the beginnings of Sanskrit literature in India; and this literature gradually developed both a scientific side (in the hands of scholars who were specialists in grammar, in law, in philosophy, in astronomy, in mathematics, in the various sciences, in dramaturgy, in stage-craft, in erotics etc.) and a side of pure literature—of *belles lèttres* when literary men began to compose narrative poems and lyrics and dramas in it, These two sides of Sanskrit literature furnished the spiritual, intellectual and aesthetic pabulum to the intelligentsia or cultured *èlite* of the whole of India whether of the North or the South, whether they spoke ancient dialects of Indo-Aryan or ancient dialects of Dravidian or Austric or Sino-Tibetan, or whether they were Brahmanists or Jainas or Buddhists. Vedic and the earlier Classical Sanskrit literature has continued its tradition right down to our day. Then, after certain protestant religious movements started within the fold of Brahmanism, like Jainism and Buddhism, for the first time in the Indo-Aryan speaking tracts in North-Eastern India, literatures expressing the points of view of these protesting and reforming philosophers and

teachers came into being — in new literary languages which were based on the 'Middle Indo-Aryan or *Prākrit* — like the Jaina Ardha-Māgadhī (which was based on the speech of Eastern Uttara Pradesa); the original language of the Buddhist canon, which was a kind of Proto-Māgadhī, and was the current speech of Bihar; and then Pāli, which was actually an early literary form, much influenced by Sanskrit, of the speech of the Śaurasēnī area round about Mathurā and going down to Ujjayinī; besides Gāthā or Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, which was the result of a compromise between the Old Indo-Aryan Sanskrit and the Middle Indo-Aryan dialects. This literature in Middle Indo-Aryan then continued to have its place in the historical sequence of speech and literary expression in Aryandom. At a later stage, quite a mass of secular literature developed in the later Prakrits also - the earlier Prakrits of the Buddhists and the Jainas were concerned mainly with philosophy and religion and the lives and teachings of Buddha and of Mahāvīra and other Jinas. Then round about 1000 A. D. came up the period of the *Bhāshās* or the Modern or New Indo-Aryan languages, and for near above 1000 years, we are having a literary output in the various *Bhāshās* or New Indo-Aryan speeches. The New Indo-Aryan languages were born out of a transformation of Middle Indo-Aryan or the Prakrits. They came with a great inheritance behind them — the earlier literatures in Middle Indo-Aryan and in Old Indo-Aryan (in Prakrit and in Sanskrit) which were never forgotten (particularly that of Sanskrit); and Sanskrit continued to be studied and to be a source of literary inspiration for the New Indo-Aryan speeches. In the case of the New Indo-Aryan languages, at least in their earlier, pre-British

phases, they present a mass of literary compositions of a very high artistic as well as intellectual and spiritual value. And in recent years, there has been, under the European impact through English literature, a new orientation in the literatures in the New Indo-Aryan languages, with an attendant widening of their horizon and development of new types not known before.

**2. The "Three Matters" of New Indo-Aryan Literature.**

This earlier narrative literature of the New Indo-Aryan languages, however, appears to present three distinct types, when we consider the subject-matter, the themes treated in them and the atmosphere and mentality of the writers. There was a noteworthy variety of subject-matter which was more extensive than in the narrative literature of the earlier phases of the Aryan, *viz.* Prakrit and Sanskrit. It was in this way.

A medieval French Poet, in speaking of the various types of romances and tales which were being put into verse for the pleasure and edification of the people speaking and understanding French, said that there were three kinds of *Matière* i e. Matter, or Subject-matter in literature, as he knew them in French. These were:

(1) the "Matter of France", (2) the "Matter of Britain", and (3) the "Matter of Rome".

The Matter of France was concerned with the historical achievements of personalities who are specifically connected with France, and they appear to have become national heroes or characters for France. The stories relating to Emperor Charlemagne and his

circle — e.g. Roland and the other Paladins — formed the Matter of France.

The Matter of Britain referred to the stories about King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table, and the heroines connected with Arthur's court; and King Arthur belonged to Britain, and most of these stories (at least in their oldest forms) were obtained from the British or Welsh language, to start with. They are specifically of Britain in their origin, and not of France.

Finally, the Matter of Rome refers to all the stories of the classical world—myths and hero-tales and romances, which came ultimately from Greece and Rome, and the sources for these were in Latin, the language of " Rome the Great ".

(Jean Bodel, end of the 12th century, quoted by W. H. Schofield in his " English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer ", London 1906, page 147 :

> " Ne sont que trois matières a nul home intendent,
> De France, et de Bretagne, et de Rome la grant".)

Similarly, in treating of the subject-matter, as in the literatures in the modern Indo-Aryan languages, we see that there are three " Matters " :

(1) The Matter of Ancient India ;

(2) The Matter of the particular area or province of the New Indo-Aryan language itself ; and

(3) The Matter of the Islamic World.

(1) In a Modern Indo-Aryan language like Hindi or Bengali, Marathi or Assamese, we have in the first instance a mass of literature which was obtained as a heritage from ancient India—from Sanskrit sources. This embodies the entire mass of religious and narrative literature as in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*, the *Bhāgavata* and other *Purāṇas*, and in the religious as well as secular literature of Sanskrit. All the Modern or New Indo-Aryan languages have quite a number of translations or adaptations of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* as well as the Purāṇa stories and Sanskrit narrative poems, dramas and romances, and their imitations. All this forms a sort of a pan-Indian basis, a mass of stories linking up together all the New Indo-Aryan languages and their literatures.

Following this we have —

(2) the Matter of the Various Linguistic Areas. Certain legendary, romantic and historical stories came to have their origin and to be developed in different parts of the country, more or less distinct from each other in their style and atmosphere or *cachet*, and they acquired a very great popularity These stories related to the heroes and the heroines who lived and flourished in the different new linguistic areas in the medieval period, after the great days of ancient or classical India as described in the Purāṇas and the Epics (and partly in the Sangam Literature of Old Tamil) were over. These stories formed a new layer of legendary and historical Purāṇa which did not originate from and did not require any reference to ancient (i.e. pre-Muslim) Indian tradition, generally. Thus we have the stories of Lāu-sen and Kānaḍā, of Bihulā and Lakhindhar, of Dhanapati Sadāgar (Bāniyā) and Śrīmanta Sadāgar and of

Kālakētu and Phullarā in medieval Bengal, besides a later series of beautiful romantic and historical ballads like those from Maimansingh and other East Bengal districts, which were quite distinctive for Bengali. We have similarly a mass of tales of chivalry of the Rajputs within the Hindi and Gujarati orbits, or stories like those of Madhu and Mālatī, Lōr and Chandā, of Ḍhōlā and Mārū, as in North India and in Rājasthan, or of Rājā Risālū as in the Panjab. We have also the *Pōwāḍās* or historical ballads relating to the Maratha period in Marathi. Each linguistic area can present this Matter of Local Legends and Stories which are peculiar to that area, and quite distinctive in themselves; and this Local Matter is prominently an independent and characteristic literary expression of that language. In some areas, this Local Matter came in for literary treatment quite early, in others it was late. But nevertheless, it is found everywhere. Some local stories came to have an all-India vogue, e.g. the story of Gōpīchanda Rājā and his mother Mayanāmatī, which originated in Bengal but spread as far west as the Panjab and Mahārāshṭra.

(3) Finally, we have the Matter of the Islamic World. This came to India as the result of the direct impact of Islam on the Indian scene, and of the influence of Persian literature on the Indian mind. Whatever of the romantic was available in pre-Muhammadan and post-Muhammadan Arabdom (e.g the story of Hātim at-Tāyī, of Lailah and Majnūn, and the mass of tales and romances in the Arabic *Alf Laylah wa Laylah* or "the Arabian Nights"), also came along with the Islamic religion into India, and influenced India chiefly through Persian literary compositions. The ancient pre-Islamic legends

of Persia also, for example, as in the *Shāh-nāmah* of Firdausī and in the works of Nizāmī, came with this Islamic inheritance. We can see how there developed gradually a set or subject-matter of tales and legends which would please Indian Muslims, who began to look back wistfully to the legendary lore of the new religion of their adoption; and as a result of this, the Matter of Islam, i. e. of both Arabia and Persia, came to be treated in the Indian languages. These Islamic subjects (including both pre-Islamic Arabic as well as Iranian also) were first treated in Bengali and in Dakhni Hindi, and they are found in driblets in most of the other languages also. But it was the Urdu form of Hindustani, and also Kashmiri, which among all the Indian languages gave the fullest literary expression to this "Matter of Islam."

This is generally the situation for the literatures in the Aryan languages of India. But let us see what it is like in the literatures in the great Dravidian languages.

### 3. Literature in the Dravidian Languages: A Tentative Division into Periods.

Tamil, Telugu and Kannada are the three great languages which are the main repositories of the Dravidian contribution to Indian literature. Malayalam literature is also very valuable and important. But linguistically Malayalam and Tamil belong to the same circle, and, as it is well-known, modern Malayalam like modern Tamil goes back to oldest Sangam Tamil as its source-form. Tamil literature is rather conservative, as the language also is with regard to its vocabulary. Tamil literature (in its Sangam texts)

has preserved a good deal of compositions in the primitive, pure or unmixed Tamil as a whole, whereas Malayalam literature, as much as the language itself, has been profoundly modified by Sanskrit. The Sanskrit element in all these languages (which is in its highest in Malayalam and Telugu) has exerted such a very great influence on the language itself, and all the South Indian literatures are so much within the orbit of Sanskrit, that Sanskrit can very rightly be looked upon as the Classical Language *par excellence* for all of them, including Tamil also; just as Latin is the classical language not only for the Modern Romanic or Latin languages like Italian, French, Provençal, Catalan, Spanish and Rumanian which are derived from Latin, but also for other languages which are not derived from Latin, like the Germanic Indo-European languages — English, German and Dutch, and a non Indo-Europen Finno-Ugrian language like Hungarian or Magyar. The Sanskrit vocabulary of Tamil, as ordinarily used, is of course not so very extensive as in Malayalam or Kannada or Telugu. But nevertheless, so much of Sanskrit has been in the field and in the background of Tamil, that it can be said that any Sanskrit word, whether in Literature or in the Lexicon, is a prospective Tamil word. Moreover, the ideas behind Tamil literature, even of the Sangam period, have the same family character with the ideas which we find in Sanskrit literature. Of course, in the oldest phase of Old Tamil in the Sangam classics like the *Pattup-pāṭṭu* and the *Eṭṭut-tokai*, there are certain references to a social atmosphere and a literary or stylistic background which are peculiar to the Tamil country; but this is not isolated, and not at all something absolutely foreign to the Aryan Sanskrit or other Dravidian tradition.

In the case of the Aryan languages we have in their development three main periods :–

(1) Old Indo-Aryan, represented by Vedic and Classical Sanskrit: roughly, from 1500 B. C. to 600 B. C.

(2) Middle Indo-Aryan – represented by the Pali and the Prakrits, as well as the Apabhraṃśas : roughly, from 600 B. C. to 1000 A. D.

(3) New Indo-Aryan – represented by the Modern Indo-Aryan *Bhāshās*: after1000 A. D.

But for the Dravidian languages, we cannot easily and categorically pose the same three periods like Old or Primitive Dravidian, Middle Dravidian and New or Modern Dravidian. All that we can say for the Dravidian languages would be that there is an Old Period for the languages in their totality, which goes back to times before 1300 or 1200 or 1100 A.D., and a period which comes after that, right down to our day. Behind this Old Period prior to 1300 or 1100 A.D. we have, particularly in the Inscriptions, and in the earlier Sangam Literature and the earliest religious literature of the Śaiva and Vaishṇava saints in Tamil, a stage of the language which may go back to the centuries round about Christ. An average speaker of a cultivated Dravidian language of the modern day will not have much difficulty in reading books composed in the 17th, 16th, 15th or 14th centuries. But the more one goes backward in point of time, the more unfamiliar and difficult the language becomes. For understanding the language as represented in written literature or in inscriptions from the period round about 1200 A.D, back to the earlier centuries before that, it would be

necessary to have an expert's knowledge of it — a systematic acquaintance with it in both its grammar, and vocabulary, and syntax, is an indispensable preliminary. A general agreement in time sequence, and in attendant linguistic development, between Indo-Aryan and Dravidian, however, is found, and can be posited. In other words, the cultivated Dravidian languages in their extant literary specimens can be divided into three stages, as in the case of Indo-Aryan, going back from the new to the old as follows.

We have now the Last Stage, or Third Stage, of Dravidian — namely the New or Modern Dravidian Stage — which roughly begins from 1800 A.D., when these languages came in intimate contact with European languages, particularly English.

Before this, we have the second stage, a Middle Dravidian period, from say 1100 or 1200 or even 1300 A.D. (according to language) to 1800 A.D. ; and behind that we have got to mention an earlier stage, the Old Dravidian stage, which roughly begins from about the time of Christ or a few centuries after that, and comes down to the Middle Dravidian stage, the approximate age for which differs in the different languages.

We do not have any authentic literary materials prior to this Old Dravidian stage, and for that we might postulate for each of the individual language an "Ancient Period"; current, as it may occasionally be postulated, c. 500 B.C. ; and these "Ancient" forms of the Dravidian languages converge back into or emanate from what may be called a single type of speech, to which we might give the name "Primitive Dravidian of Ancient India" which conceiveably goes to times before 1000 B.C.

**4. Types of lyrical as well as Narrative Literature of more or less Local Inspiration in the Cultivated Dravidian Languages.**

It is unfortunate that we have no specimens of literature in any Dravidian language prior to what we have in the Sangam literature of Old Tamil. Owing to the presence of common words for poetical Composition in the Southern Dravidian languages like the Tamil and Malayalam *pāṭṭu*, Telugu *pāṭu*, Kannada *paṭu* > *haṭu*, it would appear that there was doubtless a Primitive Dravidian Inheritance of verse compositions for all the cultivated South Dravidian languages. It is also to be seen to what extent the old and native metres of Tamil and Malayalam, the *dēśī* metres of Telugu and Kannada, as well as the metres in use in the uncultivated Dravidian languages, have an ultimate Primitive Dravidian basis, which will demonstrate the existence of some kind of poetic literature in "Ancient" and even Primitive Dravidian, the traditions of which were continued down to the "Old" stage of the present day Dravidian Languages, and were in some cases carried down to our day. See in this connexion K. Rāmakrishnayya's paper "A Common Literary and Prosodiacal Tradition in South Indian Languages," Oriental Research Institute Centenary Number, University of Madras, 1957, pp. 9–15, where his conclusion is this: "Thus in very many aspects of early literary tradition where the Sanskrit influence was not very much felt, the early compositions of the Dēśī literature [in Kannada and Telugu] can easily be compared with that of Tamil. This points to a common Dravidian element of literary tradition, which seems to have been shared by these major languages of the

group and developed by each in its own way." Old Tamil preserved it more or less intact, and it was fortunate in having a work like the *Tolkāppiyam*, in the third section of which, relating to *Poruḷ* or subject-matter of poetry, we have a rhetorical analysis, with examples of Tamil poetry at its oldest and perhaps purest. In Telugu we have different kinds of songs or poems which have been noted by historians of Telugu literature, like Prof. P. Chenchiah and Rao Bahadure Rajá M. Bhujanga (Calcutta. 1928). Thus we have *Lāli-pāṭalu* or "Cradle Songs", *Mēlu-Kolupulu* of "Songs of the Dawn (when farmers go to work)," *Jāvaḷilu* or Songs of Love", *Ūḍupu-pāṭalu* or "Songs of the Harvest", *Kuli-pāṭalu* or "Songs of the Field Labourers", *Kallu-pāṭalu* or "Songs of Wine", *Āṭa-pāṭalu* or "Songs of Play", *Maṅgala-pāṭalu* or "Songs of Festivals", and *Vīra-pāṭalu* or "Songs or Ballads of Heroes". Similarly, Malayalam has its characteristic songs and ballads which are of pure Malayalam origin—the *Pazhaya-pāṭṭukaḷ* or "Old Songs" as they have been called, and these are outside the orbit of the literary influence of either Sanskrit or Tamil; and they comprise ballads relating to the medieval heroes and personalities of Kērala, and may be said to present the proper "Matter of Kērala" in Malayalam Literature. These poems, even though they are in Modern Telugu or Modern Malayalam, are suggestive of the earlier pre-Aryan tradition in Dravidian poetry.

In Old Tamil we have also a series of narrative poems beginning with the so-called epics of *Cilapp'atikāram* and *Maṇi-mēkalai*. Such a tradition of composing narrative poems on themes which belong specifically to the Andhra and Karṇāṭaka peoples, which presumably

existed in Ancient Telugu and Ancient Kannada, unfortunately have not survived, at least in its old form; although in later times in these languages we find new types of ballads both relating to local heroes and local events as well as to social and religious conditions or ideals. These new ballads, so very characteristic of the local history and culture of Andhra and Karṇāṭaka (as much as similar ballads in Malayalam are representative of Kērala) are in the current spoken language of the people, and they certainly represent a folk (as opposed to the scholarly) tradition in literature. In ancient times in North India, outside of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*, such early popular themes of narrative poetry we find, for example in the great romance of Udayana and Vāsava-dattā, which spread also to the South (though not as a religious classic) and was treated in an Old Tamil narrative poem, which is considered as one of the earliest *kāvyas* of Old Tamil, the *Perum-Kathai* or "the Great Story" (Sanskrit, *Bṛihat-Kathā*) composed by Koṅgu Veḷir. A story like this appears to have been very popular, and it passed on to the South quite early, along with many of the Brahmanical *Purāṇa* stories and Jaina religious romances and the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* tales as well. The border line between *Purāṇa* stories and the great stories as of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* on the one hand, and popular narrative stories like that of Udayana and Vāsava-dattā on the other, is very hard to determine in ancient North Indian literature. The Udayana–Vāsava-dattā romance has been illustrated in one of the earliest pieces of narrative sculpture in India, in the Rani Gumpha Cave bas-reliefs in Orissa, dating from the 2nd century B. C. At that time Orissa was in all likelihood Dravidian-speaking, using a

language which may be described as Primitive or Ancient Telugu.

The Kannada language was still less fortunate than Tamil, and the vestiges of early literature in Kannada are meagre indeed. It would appear that there has been through Jainism and Brahmanism, and latterly through the Vīra-Śaiva sect, a complete re-orientation of Kannada literature from its early bearings. Certain literary *genres* or types like the Yaksha-gāna in Kannada, and certain old metres look like being survivals or continuations of the Old Dravidian spirit or tradition in literature, in Kannada and in Telugu, as also suggested by the late Prof. K. Ramakrishnayya. Kannada, equally with Telugu, has a large mass of folk-literature of all sorts—songs referring to family-life (children's songs, love songs, wedding songs, songs to accompany household work as well as games, etc.), which employ the ordinary metres like *dvipadi*, *tripadi*, *caupadi*, *ṣaṭpadi*, *sāṅgatya*, and *ragaḷe*, besides a number of other types of metres not discussed or recognised in the classical prosody of the language. The language is always popular, with many words which are never or hardly used in learned literature. Difference in dialect is there, but that does not prevent intelligibility. Ballads treating of heroic and romantic themes are also found, and these are known as *Lāvaṇis*, a word probably taken over from Marathi. There is a well-known *Lāvaṇi* on Seringapatam and its history. *Honnamma Katha* is a touching ballad or song of the sorrows of childless women. Serious studies of these Kannada ballads and songs have just been taken up. They are available in print in cheap *bazar* editions for the masses, and they are more sung and listened to than read. They present

the true "Matter of Karṇāṭa" in literature, and their collection into a *corpus* has just been undertaken, as e. g., in the *Nāḍapadagaḷu* of M. Ramaswami and M. Krishnamurti edited by L. Gundappa (Bangalore, 1947).

Telugu has a little narrative literature of tales and ballads which are specifically of late medieval Andhra-Dēśa. But the Telugu people, one might say, were always ballad-minded, and took a lively interest in their own life and in their traditions. Two of the most remarkable works in Middle Telugu dealing in a refreshing manner with local Telugu themes, are the *Pālnāṭi-Vīra-caritra* and the *Vidhi-nāṭaka* of Śrīnātha (1365–1440). The former is a verse romance of love and war among the local Telugu barons of the day, a subject quite out-side of the usual run of *Purāṇa* tales which are so popular; and the latter, professedly a treatise on the drama, gives a vivid account of life in a Telugu city like Rājamahendri in the poet's days, including sketches of the women he meets in the streets. Similarly we may mention the *Krīḍābhirāmamu* of Vinukoṇḍa Vallabha (c. 1420), which gives an account of Warangal (Vorak-kal) city of his time. Telugu songs and ballads about some of the earlier heroes and heroines of Andhra-Dēśa, belonging to the Eastern Chalukya and Kākatīya times (e.g. Akkadur, c. 1050 A.D.; Nayakuralu or Nāgamma, 12th century; and the Kākatīya queens Rudramba and Gaṇapamba, 13th century) are known. But the best period of Telugu ballads celebrating the "Matter of Andhra" is the 17th–18th centuries. One may mention the historical ballad of Sarvayi Papadu, sung all over Andhra-dēśa; and the *Bobbili-Kathā*, describing the fights of the Telugu Rajas (1757) – Gōpālakṛishṇa

Raṅga Rāo of Bobbili and Vijayarāmarāju of Vijayanagaram in the Viśākhāpaṭṭanam area, which specially celebrates the courage and daring of Tandra Pāpayya, the brother-in-law of Raṅga Rāo. Ballads of this type are in simple, even colloquial language, and are forceful, and always arouse the sympathy of the hearer or reader. There seems to be still lacking a good collection of Telugu Ballads, and in this connexion one has to mention gratefully the pioneer work of the Englishman J. Boyle (*Telugu Ballad Poetry*: Indian Antiquary Vol. III, 1874, pp. 1 ff.)

In Malayalam there is also quite a noteworthy legacy of historical ballads which are of course not very old, but nevertheless are quite characteristic of the Kērala country in late medieval times.

It would appear that Malayalam has a richer and a more varied repertoire of Ballad and other popular literature than Tamil, Kannada and Telugu. I can do no better than quote here the following Note on the Ballads of Kērala which was kindly prepared for me by Śrī Bālasubrahmaṇyan of the National Library of India in Calcutta:

"Kērala has a large repertory of ballads which contain a mine of information regarding the history, culture and social customs of the people of the ancient period. Until recent times, enough attention was not given to them, and many of these treasures might have been lost for ever, but for the efforts of Percy Macqueen and Dr. G. Achuta Menon who were the first to realise their great importance. According to the scholars, the ballads are about 300 to 400 years old,

The authors of these ballads preferred to be anonymous. They were the main source of entertainment to the people. Both men and women working in the fields or engaged in other occupations sang and enjoyed these songs which relieved the monotony of their work and made them forget their weariness One can find a striking uniformity in most of the ballads as to the romantic mould in which they are cast, the diction and rhythm, and also the moving and charming narration of the stories. The most significant feature of these ballads is that they are absolutely free from any foreign influence, and their form and subject-matter are thoroughly indigenous. They represent the spoken tongue of the country in its unadulterated form, and are of immense use to the student of the Malayalam language.

"The most prominent of the ballads are the *Vaṭakkan Pāṭṭukaḷ* which comprehends a large number of popular songs current in North Malabar. The exploits and romances of two families, Puttūram and Taccōḷi, in North Malabar, bulk large in them. The Puttūram ballads, relating to the family of Ārōmal-cēvakar, the well-known Īzhavan hero, are considered to be the earliest. They narrate a thrilling story of revenge and intrigue. Those were days when disputes were settled adopting the dictum "might is right". These songs throw considerable light on the polity and society of Kērala of that period. The ballad about Uṇṇyārcca, the sister of Ārōmal-cēvakar, shows that even women encountered the enemies and defeated them single-handed. The gallant achievements of heroes like Taccōḷi Otēnan, Taccōḷi Cantu and Pālāṭṭu Kōman are narrated in innumerable songs called

*Taccōḷi-Pāṭṭukaḷ*. The romance of Taccōḷi Otēnan and his heroic death also feature prominently in these songs. These display the life of the Malayalis of those days in a realistic manner, and their bold and straight dealings. Honour was to them dearer than life.

" Besides the ballads of the North, some have originated from the South also. In South Malabar the chief source of inspiration was the Cāvēr Paṇikkars' fight at the Māmaṅkam. The songs relating to Vaṭṭōli Kaṇṭar Mēnōn and Cantuṇṇi are the most thrilling. Among the Southern ballads, *Iravikkuṭṭip-piḷḷai-pōnpāṭu* dealing with the heroic sacrifice and death of the historically famous patriot Iravikkuṭṭi is considered to be the most important. It is a moving narrative containing many portions of high literary excellence.

" There are many other ballads, but only the most important of them can be mentioned in this very brief survey. The *Māppiḷap-pāṭṭukaḷ*, forming an important contribution of the Māppiḷa (Moplah) Muslim community, are very popular and enjoyable, despite their admixture of Arabic words with Malayalam. Some of the important religious ballads are *Bhadrakāḷip-pāṭṭu*, *Tōṭṭam-pāṭṭu*, *Ayyappan-pāṭṭu* and *Matilakam-pāṭṭu*, all of which pertain to the gods usually worshipped in Kērala, Religious ballads which show some Aryan influence. to mention a few, are *Māvāratam-pāṭṭu*, *Bhīma-katha* and *Pārvati-caritam*, *Vātilturap-pāṭṭu* and *Kurattip-pāṭṭu*."

Dr. K. M. George, in his valuable work *Rāmacaritam and the Study of Early Malayalam* (Kottayam, 1956) has discussed the question of what has been called the *Pacca-Malayālam* or Pure Malayalam writings, which are free from the artificial influences of both

Sanskrit and Tamil. These include the distinctive Ballad Literature in the language (cf. pp. 12 ff. of his work). A good collection of these Pure Malayalam Ballads, giving a real "Matter of Kērala", has been published, as we find the reference in Dr. George's work, in C. P. Gōvindapiḷḷa's *Pazhaya-Pāṭṭukal* or "Old Songs" (1918).

The Christians of Kērala have also their own ballads, which are also to be considered as part of the "Matter of Kērala", like the old ballad of *Mārgan Kalip-pāṭṭu* relating the deeds of Saint Thomas during his sojourn in the Chola and Kērala countries, This goes back to the times before 1500, before the coming of the Portuguese into India. Similarly the Muslim (Māppiḷa) Songs and Ballads are there, but collections exist in manuscript only, and have not been published as yet.

**5. Tamil and the Native Dravidian Tradition in Literature through the Ages: "the Matter of Classical Tamil" and the "Matter of Tamil Nad in Medieval and Modern Times."**

We should take full note of whatever would appear to be a survival of what may be called the pre-Sanskrit age in the various Dravidian languages. The "Matter of Dravida-land", however, has got to be established largely from Old Tamil. The Old Tamil Saṅgam Literature and the way in which its *Poruḷ* or subject-matter has been treated is specifically Tamil, and may possibly also be Ancient or even Primitive Dravidian. This Saṅgam literature was of course read and fully appreciated during the Old Tamil period, i.e. before 1000 A.D. But before that, although here and there scholars wrote commentaries on them, the *Poruḷ* or subject-matter of

Sangam literature became completely overlaid by pan-Indian *Purāṇa* stories and romances, so that their very memory was almost lost among the ordinary people of the Tamil country. It was only during the last three generations that a revival of Old Tamil Literature took place, and among the scholars who brought back to the Tamilians a knowledge and an appreciation of their great heritage were Mahāmahōpādhyāya Dr. V. V. Swāminātha Ayyar and S. V. Dāmōdaram Piḷḷai. Because Tamil literature shows an unbroken continuity from the oldest Saṅgam period right down to our day, Tamil people ordinarily think that what they see in this unbroken literary history for some 1800 years presents a single and unaltered language only, viz. the Tamil language. Many people fondly persuade themselves to believe that the language of the *Kuṟaḷ* is just the same as, or identical with the language of a newspaper article in present-day Tamil or of a modern poem by Subrahmaṇyan Bharati. But nothing is further from actuality. A Modern Indo-Aryan language can claim the same kind of continuity in literature, if it was declared that the traditional literature from the Vedas has continued down through the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upanishads*, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* to the *Kāvyas* in Sanskrit, through the literature in the second phase of this linguistic development in Pāli and the Prakrits as well as the Apabhraṃśas, and finally this tradition has been carried down through the Modern Indo-Aryan languages. But, as everybody admits, the Modern Indo-Aryan language had an earlier phase before 1000 A. D., and that earlier phase was that of Middle Indo–Aryan, and then behind that we have Old Indo-Aryan (Sanskrit and Vedic). But the linguistic continuity is there, although intelligibility of the phases before 1000 A.D.

is not possible without special study. The same thing holds good of any Dravidian language and its literature, when these go back to a period of 1000 years from now, A Bengali person at the present day would not be able to get the entire meaning of an Old Bengali composition of 1000 A.D, The intelligibility of the various forms of "Old Hindi" would be equally limited to a person who knows only modern Khaṛī-bōlī Hindī, and, may be one dialect: and if we take note of present-day Khaṛī bōlī Hindi and the Apabhraṃśa compositions of about 1000 A. D., it would be exceedingly difficult, well-nigh impossible for a modern Hindi speaker to get at the meaning outright, For an Englishman, similarly, Shakspere's works as printed do not present much of a difficulty, though there are many words and expressions in Shakspere (1600 A.D.) which are quite difficult for a present-day English speaker to follow. Chaucer (1380 A,D.) would be still more difficult, and to read the *Bēowulf*, the Old English or Anglo-Saxon epic poem of say about 700 A.D., it would be just like reading a new language for an English speaker, although the language of the *Bēowulf* was the earlier form of Modern English, and there is unbroken literary continuity from the *Bēowulf* to the present-day. One might say that the Sangam literature presents for Modern Tamil what may be described as its Anglo-Saxon. For a proper estimation, one could say that Old Tamil before 1000 A.D. presents a ***Classical Language*** in the true sense for speakers of Modern Tamil (and of Malayalam), as much as Latin, whether Vulgar Latin or Classical Latin, does for modern French or Italian, Spanish or Rumanian. The Sangam tradition in literature is purely a "Matter of the Tamizhakam" no doubt, but it is, for Middle and Modern Tamil,

something inherited from what may properly be described as the "Tamil Classical World". As such, one might say that Tamil has the distinction of having two separate "Matters" from classical times as subjects for its literature – the "Matter of Sanskrit", and the "Matter of Old Tamil"; and the latter would be different from the later lyrical and ballad literature of pure Andhra or Karṇāṭa or Kērala inspiration, as well as of Medieval Tamil inspiration: and these compositions along a later or newer tradition alone can properly be co-related with the "Matter of Medieval Aryandom" in the different language-areas for the North Indian Modern Aryan languages.

The scholars of Tamil during the last two generations have taken up with very great enthusiasm and success a study and appraisement of this "Classical or Old Tamil Matter" in Tamil literature. They have also studied to purpose the later series of Tamil writers whose works may be said to constitute the corpus of Middle Tamil Literature. All this is in the line of a standard cultivated literature of *classics*. Modern Tamil literature is having a revival in the hands of scholars, some of whom are affected by a rather peculiar (though understandable) sense of purism, which seeks to restore pure Tamil words which were current 1800 or 1500 or 1200 years ago in the language, in place of the Indo-Aryan borrowings, whether pure Sanskrit or Modified Sanskrit which have largely replaced them. A few cranks in England affected by an ultra-Germanic zeal wished similarly to get rid of the French and Latin words which are now indispensable in English, and brought into being artificial creations like *Earth-tilth* for 'Agriculture', *Earth-craft* for 'Geography', *Rime-craft* for

'Mathematics', *Evening-meat* for 'Dinner' or 'Supper', *Leech-craft* for 'Medicine' etc., on the model of Early Middle Engish *Again-bite* for 'Remorse', *In-wit* for 'Conscience', *Fly-net* for 'Mosquito-curtain', etc. When this is natural, in being necessary for the understanding of a learned foreign word not yet naturalised, it would be quite right and proper, like the English *Commonwealth* for Latin 'Res Publica' (and even here the word *common* is not of English origin). This purism is creating in modern written Tamil a little dislocation of the present-day or received style. But a great poet like Subrahmaṇyan Bhārati and a prose-writer like Chakravarti Rājagōpālāchāri takes Modern Tamil as it is, and creates great literature in it.

Apart from "the Matter of Classical Tamil" as in Sangam Literature, there is a real "Matter or Medieval and Present-day Tamizhakam" in the shape of the popular literature of songs and ballads. About this kind of folk-literature, which is quite racy of the soil and expressive of the life and thought of the people who are rooted to the soil, about the literary style and atmosphere for this literature on "the Matter of Tamizhakam", I can quote what my friend K. Subrahmanyan of the National Library in Calcutta writes :

"Though the ballads are placed just on the fringe of classical literature, they are a class by themselves, unexcelled for their spontaneous expression couched in simple and expressive colloquial language of the rural people. They have a metre of their own, quite pleasing to the ear. The chief characteristics of the ballads are: the presence of the invocatory verses at the beginning, the repetition of some selected lines to enhance the

narrative quality and to build up *tempo*, the belief that the heroes have divine blesssings, the use of the supernatural elements like omens, dreams etc., and the employment of redundant words to achieve balance in metre.

"On the basis of the thematic content, they can be broadly grouped as Puranic, Historical and Social Ballads. In Puranic ballads, some deviations are made to suit them to the tastes of the rural people. *Alli-aracāṇi-mālai*, *Pavaḷakkoṭi-mālai*, *Dakṣarājan-katai*, *Pārvati-kalyāṇam*, *Puvanēndran-kaḷavu-mālai* etc., belong to this category.

"Secondly, by far the most influential of the ballads are the historical ones which relate the valiant exploits of heroes like Kaṭṭabomman (the Chieftain of Palayamkoṭṭai who rose against the British towards the close of the 19th century and attained immortality in his heroic attempt), Dēsiṅgu-rājan who rose against the Moguls, Rāmappayyan (a General of Maturai Tirumalai Nāyakkar), Marudu Pāṇḍiyar and Pūlittēvar. Though historic authenticity as to the date and other details of these ballads cannot be safely vouchsafed, it cannot be denied that they throw light on some incidents otherwise suppressed by the British historians.

"Thirdly, the social ballads like *Villup-pāṭṭu* and *Amāmānai* reflect the social *milieu* of their times, like the clashing interests of the rich and poor, the social taboos that attend on those who rebel against social customs, the abject position of the property-less women in joint families, and the adventures of heroes like Maturai Vīran.

"To the students of history and to the students of colloquial Tamil, the ballads of Tamil-nad are veritable mine of information".

Among the popular ballads which are extant in Tamil, one has been specially mentioned by Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, now Vice-Chancellor of Annamalai University, as being a work which impressed him very much years ago when he first read it. He even considered it to be one of the great books which he had read. This is the ballad about Dēsiṅgu-rājan mentioned above. Through the kindness of Dr. Ramaswami Aiyar himself, I could procure a copy of this ballad in a popular edition, and I am thankful to Shri P. N. Venkatachari of the National Library in Calcutta for kindly giving me a *résumé* of this poem. This ballad refers to the fight of Dēsiṅgu-rājan of Jinji Fort against Saadatullah Khan, the Nawab of Carnatic. Dēsiṅgu-rājan, or Tēj Siṅgh, to give his correct name, was the son of a North Indian soldier, Swarūp Siṅgh, who was the Governor of Jinji Fort under the Moguls. Tēj Siṅgh was born at Jinji. The ballad gives a very vivid description of the Jinji country and the prosperity of its people, and relates the celebrations which the people held at the birth of Tēj Siṅgh at Jinji. There are certain supernatural elements in the poem. Tēj Siṅgh's father, Swarūp Siṅgh, was summoned to Delhi when Tēj Siṅgh was still in his mother's womb, where he was asked by the Mogul Emperor to tame a horse which was of divine origin. Swarūp Siṅgh could not do that, and so as a punishment he was kept in prison. Later on Tēj Siṅgh, who was born during his father's absence, grew up, and went to Delhi, succeeded in breaking the horse and so got his father released. Following

his father as Governor of Jinji, Tēj Siṅgh refused to pay tribute to the Nawab of Carnatic. This led to war between Tēj Siṅgh and the Nawab. Tēj Siṅgh's friend and associate was a Muslim soldier, Mohabat Khān, who was his friend from childhood. Both the friends displayed remarkable feats of heroism, but they were ultimately killed. Tēj Siṅgh's rule was only for a brief period of 10 months, January 1714 to October 1714. This ballad in a popular printed edition runs up to over 80 pages. It is a spirited work, written in the current colloquial of the early 18th century, when Tamil came largely under the influence of Hindustani and Persian. There is a considerable amount of verisimilitude in the descriptive passages, although a good deal of it is in the marvellous and miraculous vein; but the character and personality of Dēsiṅgu-rājan in his heroism and faithfulness have been very successfully depicted. This poem became widely popular throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, and Tamil sepoys in British times were accustomed to sing this ballad with enthusiasm. This work is just a typical specimen of what can be described as belonging to the genuine " Matter of the Tamil Nad ".

Fortunately, collections of these ballads and other stories which are specifically connected with the Tamil country (or are current there and have become naturalized, although they originated elsewhere) have been published, which may be studied, analysed and put to use by specialists. Mention may be made in this context of the seven volumes, so far published, of the *Ten-nāṭṭu Pazham Kathaikaḷ* (" Traditional Stories of the Southern Land "), edited by S. A. Ramaswami Pulavar and others, which have been brought out

by the South India Śaiva-Siddhānta Works Publishing Society of Tirunelvelli. The Dēsiṅgu-rājan story is included in this work. There are scores of tales in this compilation, and unquestionably they embody a good deal of "the Matter of the Tamil Nad" in literature.

In order to understand and appreciate the basic and characteristic contribution of Dravida-land to Indian literature as a whole, we have thus to take full note of "the Matter of Tiraviḍa-nāḍu or Drāviḍa-dēśa". This is to be found, of course, for the Classical, Old Dravidian Period, in the Sangam Literature of Tamil, in the first instance. Then the rather neglected field of modern Dravidian folk-literature of songs and ballads, not only in the developed or advanced languages like Tamil, Malayalam, Kannada and Telugu, but also in the uncultivated speeches, wherever they are found, like Tulu, Kota, Toda, Kolami, Kandh or Kui, Kurukh, Malto, Gondi etc. and the distant Brahui, are to be brought under requisition. For the cultivated languages, the ballads embody the folk-spirit, the basic Drāviḍa world, where we have actual action exalted by poetic sensibility; and this should have, by virtue of its peculiar colour and *cachet*, its own place beside similar folk-literatures of the world, refusing to submit to learned literary tradition which frequently is a cultural imposition from outside—beside the ballad literature of peoples like, for example, the Marathas, the Russians, the Yugoslavs, the Spaniards, the English, the Turks the modern Greeks, and many others.